

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1407308



The Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE  
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA









THE  
HISTORY  
OF THE  
Church of England.

Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California



DA  
5055  
C3  
1849  
V. 1

THE

HISTORY

OF THE

**Church of England.**

BY

J. B. S. CARWITHEN, B.D.

LATE OF ST. MARY HALL, OXFORD; BAMPTON LECTURER FOR 1809;  
AND VICAR OF SANDHURST, BERKS.

PARTS I. AND II.

— “That posterity may know we have not loosely, through silence, permitted things to pass away as in a dream, there shall be for men’s information extant thus much concerning the state of the Church of God established amongst us.” HOOKER.

SECOND EDITION.

VOL. I.

OXFORD,  
JOHN HENRY PARKER;  
AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

MDCCXLIX.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

## NOTICE OF THE AUTHOR.

---

JOHN BAYLY SOMERS CARWITHEN, Author of the ‘ History of the Church of England,’ was born at the Parsonage House, Manaton, Devon, on the 10th of April, 1781. His father, William Carwithen, B.A. was Rector of the parish: he had three children. The above-named was the eldest; William, the present Rector of Stoke Climsland in Cornwall, and D.D. the second; and Charles, who died unmarried 27th of April, 1827.

The subject of this Memoir was brought up under his father at Totnes Grammar School, and, having finished his education there, was entered at St. Mary Hall, Oxford, and Matriculated on the 18th of February, 1796. He took the degree of B.A. on the 25th of February, 1800; of M.A. July 7th, 1803; and in November, 1825, he proceeded to the degree of B.D.

Mr. Carwithen entered into Holy Orders as Deacon on the 25th of September, 1803, being ordained on the Curacy of Manaton, a Benefice that has belonged to the family for many years, and of which his Nephew is now the Incumbent. On the 25th of August, 1805, he was ordained Priest, and served in succession the cures of Birdford, and of Sidbury, Devon; Wiviliscombe, Somerset; and Mere, Wilts. On the 10th of September, 1810, he was licensed

School of Theology  
at Claremont

19978

to the Perpetual Curacy of Sandhurst, Berks; to which he was presented by the Dean of Salisbury; and subsequently in 1814, to the Perpetual Curacy of Frimley, Hants; an adjoining parish, on the presentation of the Rev. Henry Lee, Rector of Ash.

In the mean time, Mr. Carwithen had been appointed to preach the Bampton Lectures in 1809, and one of the Select Preachers in Mich. Term, 1812.

The subject chosen by our Author for his Bampton Lectures was the Religion of Bramah; and the title he has prefixed to them is, '*A View of the Brahminical Religion in its Confirmation of the Truth of the Sacred History, and its Influence on the Moral Character.*'

A few observations and extracts will convey some idea of the character of Mr. Carwithen's first publication.

The first Discourse is called 'A general view of the Brahminical System,' and is taken up in preparing the way for those that follow, and unfolding the design of the whole.

The second, third, and fourth, are occupied respectively with a comparison between Brahminical Chronology, the Traditions of the Deluge, and the Settlement of Nations, with the Records of Sacred History. They encourage the formation of sound and sober views rather than the indulgence of conjecture; and being adapted for delivery, are popular rather than learned. In an Advertisement at the beginning of the volume the Author states, that the few notes which illustrate his arguments are principally designed for readers unacquainted with Asiatic literature. From the fifth Discourse, on 'the correspondence of the Brahminical system with the primeval Religion of Mankind,' the following extract concerning the doctrine of the 'fall of

Man' is a good specimen of Mr. Carwithen's views and language.

"The idea that man was originally placed by his Creator in a state of perfect enjoyment, which he forfeited by some transgression of his own, would scarcely have suggested itself without a foundation in reality. Such an event is the most unlikely solution which human reason would have devised to account for the origin of evil. It is probably the last conclusion which the human mind on a survey of the actual condition of the universe would be likely to embrace. On a candid review of the general harmony which prevails throughout the order of nature, of the marks of beneficent contrivance, of the adaptation of agents to ends, and on a comparison of the good and evil which are blended in it, we cannot forbear drawing the conclusion, that the preponderance is decidedly in favour of the former. 'It is a happy world after all,' we should be obliged to exclaim with an amiable Christian moralist. But even if the concession should be made that man has a propensity to magnify beyond its just proportions the sum of natural and moral evil, or that there really exists a considerable sum of both, still the conclusion, that either the one or the other is a just punishment inflicted on man by his Creator on account of some transgression committed in a former and happier state, would never have been drawn. The remark may perhaps be hazarded without danger of contradiction, that the most probable solution which the human mind, unaided by the light of revelation, would adopt, if not at once enveloped in the gloom of atheism, would be that which has prevailed so widely throughout the Eastern world, the Manichæan doctrine of two opposite principles

of equal force, alternately controlling the affairs of the world.

" But yet we find that the most common method of accounting for the origin of evil, is the degeneracy of man from a state of purity to a state of corruption: a doctrine which has retained a place in the popular creed of every nation. Of Brahmanism it may be almost said to form the basis. It is this idea which has regulated its elaborate scheme of Chronology; it is this idea which causes its followers to submit to the most excruciating penances, in order to purge the soul from the stains which she has contracted during her abode in this polluted body. They have indeed corrupted and obscured this doctrine: they have engrafted on it additions which do not properly belong to it. It has been carried so far as to inspire them with a hatred of life, and a dereliction of every worldly enjoyment: they have continually placed before their eyes the accomplishment of that melancholy period, when a total decay of bodily strength as well as entire degeneracy of morals shall increase the sum of present misery: but these deviations from the truth could never have happened, unless they had truth itself for a foundation. These are phantoms of the imagination which could never have existed, if they had not been derived from some correspondent reality."

The sixth Discourse is on 'the Brahminical Representations of the Deity operating as a preservative of Moral Purity and as a source of Happiness.' This portion of the Lectures successfully accounts for that 'holding of the truth in unrighteousness,' which is a characteristic of the Hindoo religion. The doctrine of the Unity and Supreme Majesty of God is lost to all practical ends 'by

removing the supreme Being so far beyond the reach of ordinary contemplation.' The seventh Discourse is an enquiry into 'the effect on the intellectual faculties which the Brahminical system produces;' and the eighth considers its 'operations on the social affections.' In the former is an acknowledged truth so happily expressed as to deserve to be pointed out: 'A revealed code of morality and a revealed science both agree in this respect; they equally preclude all change or improvement. But it is not less necessary for the happiness of mankind that the first should be unalterably fixed, than that the latter [science] should be enlarged by invention and corrected by experience.' The eighth contains an excellent contrast between the *exclusiveness* attributed by infidels to the Christian faith, and the real *intolerance* that exists in the religion of Brahma; and at its conclusion the Author introduces the subject of his ninth and last Discourse, the 'Practicability of introducing Christianity into India.'

After alluding to the failure of previous attempts, he maintains 'that the conversion of the Hindoos should be the object of our second care; that it should be our first concern, as it is our most solemn and indispensable duty, to provide for the religious instruction and for the preservation of religious knowledge among our own countrymen resident in India.'

Here we may remember, to our sorrow and to our disgrace as a Christian nation, that when this was written there was no Bishop of our Church in all India. The reproach, however, was beginning to be felt generally at that time; and in his second proposition, Mr. Carwithen embodied and probably strengthened the feeling that issued in the appointment of the learned and admirable

Dr. Middleton to be the first Bishop of Calcutta. He asserted, that ‘no scheme for the conversion of the Hindoos can be safely prosecuted without the superintendence of a British Ecclesiastical Establishment.’ He then points out the immense advantages that such an Establishment would confer on literature and education; in which he was borne out by the institution of Bishop’s College, a noble memorial of the first Protestant Prelate of India, and by its eminent services from the year 1819 up to the present time<sup>a</sup>. He compares the distribution of the Scriptures with the active ministrations of a regular Clergy, and shews that the only way to counteract the misguided and pernicious efforts of religious sectarians in our colonies is to form an Ecclesiastical Establishment.

His third proposition is, ‘that no attempts at converting the Hindoos can be safely prosecuted, unless under the conviction that their efficacy will be slow.’ Such were the opinions entertained by Mr. Carwithen on a question still undetermined; of which, however, it may be said, that if he did not completely answer it, subsequent events have tended to prove that he approached as near to its solution as any writer of his own age. His vigorous style and comprehensive views will always recommend the Lectures to many readers.

In the year 1818, Mr. Carwithen addressed two Letters

<sup>a</sup> The report of Bishop’s College, and its Missions for 1847, 1848, states, that there ‘are twenty-three students resident within the College, of whom seventeen intending to devote themselves to the ministry of the Gospel are maintained at the Society’s sole cost.’ The sound instruction received by the students at the hands of Professor Street, and the steady operations of the Press at the College, are at once a proof that the spirit which founded it is not lost, and a pledge of increasing usefulness.

to the Rev. Daniel Wilson, M.A. The first, dated Feb. 20, was in reply to his defence of the Church Missionary Society; the second, dated May 7, is on ‘The Hostility of the Church of England Missionary Society towards the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.’

His last and best production was the ‘History of the Church of England,’ a second Edition of which is now offered to the public. The first Part of it, up to the Restoration of the Church and Monarchy in 1660, contained in two volumes, was brought out in the year 1829. The second Part, one volume, extending to the Revolution in 1688, was printed after his decease, and published in 1833. The two Parts will now be combined together, and form two volumes.

The favourable reception that this Work met with when it was first published, may be gathered from the estimate formed of the Author’s principles and powers by periodical writers of his day.

In No. XIII. of the British Critic for Jan. 1830, there appeared an Article on the two first volumes, from which the following paragraphs have been selected. “He (Mr. Carwithen) partakes in no degree of that puling liberalism which, through want of ability to apply any accurate scale of measurement to the comparative height of objects before us, adopts the short and easy method of reducing them all to the same flat, dull, and undistinguished level.” Again: “The history of Elizabethan Puritanism necessarily leads us to an account of Hooker, and a rapid analysis of his Ecclesiastical Polity. That great man has already found a glowing eulogist in Mr. Hallam, who has been warmed

by his subject into eloquence ; but Mr. Carwithen need not shrink from comparison with that which we consider among the best written passages of the *Constitutional History.*"

In No. xxviii. of the same periodical there is a notice of the third volume, published in 1833. It is there stated, that "in fidelity of narrative, in accuracy of judgment, and in soundness of principle, this posthumous volume deservedly claims full brotherhood with its elders ;" and in conclusion, " Sober facts and sedate argument are the guides which Mr. Carwithen has chosen : and under their pilotage he has framed a Work forming a most honourable monument to his own memory as a well-read Historian, a sound Divine, and a charitable Christian."

These tributes of respect and approbation have additional value when it is known, that they came from the pen of that highly-gifted writer, the late Rev. E. Smedley. Equally favourable notices of this History appeared in several other Quarterly and Monthly publications.

In preparing a new Edition of this Work, the Editor has chiefly aimed at putting it into a cheaper form, for the convenience of Students in Divinity ; the only alterations of importance that have been made are a more exact adherence to the words and spelling of old authors ; a running title placed at the top of the page ; all the footnotes have been verified and paged, a list of Editions of Authors quoted has been supplied, and an Index of the principal matter has been added.

It remains only to record, that Mr. Carwithen married Harriet Elizabeth, widow of the Rev. Augustus Samuel Faulknor, and daughter of Lieut.-Gen. W. Spry, on the 22d of February, 1822. She was a lady of engaging

manners and great benevolence. She died in the year 1830; and in 1832, on the 24th of February, at Sandhurst Vicarage, Mr. Carwithen ‘went to his rest;’ he left no children, and appointed his brother, the Rev. W. Carwithen, D.D. his sole Executor and Administrator.

Arms, Argent, a Fleur-de-lis Gules, a Border Engrailed of the Second.

W. R. BROWELL.

*Beaumont Rectory, Essex, 1849.*



TO THE  
RIGHT REV. CHARLES LLOYD, D.D.

LORD BISHOP, AND REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY  
IN THE UNIVERSITY, OF OXFORD.

MY LORD,

IF the present undertaking had not been encouraged by your approbation, I should have been impelled by many powerful motives to solicit for a History of the Church of England the patronage of the Theological Professor of the University of Oxford. A lively sense of personal gratitude to the University; a strong attachment to those principles of orthodoxy to which it has inflexibly adhered; and an earnest hope that my labours may be useful in assisting the studies of its rising youth; all these sentiments would have induced me to offer the following Work to your Lordship's acceptance and protection.

In that eventful portion of our ecclesiastical history, which these volumes comprise, a large and a distinguished space is filled by your Lordship's predecessors in the Academical Chair. One of the most eminent, the judicious Sanderson, exhibits a character which the historian cannot contemplate without advantage, and which he may safely propose to himself as a model. Living in an age when party spirit raged with unparalleled fury, and vented itself in polemical divinity; devoted to a branch of his profession not cultivated in a Protestant Church, a branch of study the most dangerous when not under the control of a sound

judgment and an honest heart; this illustrious theologian nobly withstood the temptation of perverting casuistry to the purposes of private inclination, popular favour, or temporal greatness, and directed his patient inquiries and laborious deductions to the promotion of truth, piety, and peace.

These great objects I have endeavoured to keep in view, and trust that I have not failed; for, in the absence of other requisites, I fearlessly lay claim to diligence and candour. Your Lordship eminently possessing these qualities, in conjunction with many others, can fully appreciate the difficulties of my task, and excuse the unavoidable deficiencies in its performance. That it has not been previously attempted by one more competent than myself, may be a matter of surprise as well as regret. In the part which is now presented to the public, I have been preceded by many writers, but their works are calculated for reference rather than for general reading. In the part which, by the Divine blessing, is to follow, the path is untrodden, and the modern history of the English Church is still a desideratum in the literature of the country.

I have the honour to be,  
With great respect,  
Your Lordship's most obedient servant,

J. B. S. CARWITHEN.

*Sandhurst,  
January, 1829.*

# CONTENTS

OF

## VOL. I.

---

### CHAPTER I.

- Preliminary View of the English Church before the Reformation.—  
Divided into three Eras.—I. The Anglo-Saxon Church, from the  
time of Augustine to the Conquest.—II. From the Norman Conquest  
to the Reign of King John.—III. From Magna Charta to the  
Reformation. Page 1.

### CHAPTER II.

- State of Europe at the beginning of the 16th Century.—Of England  
and the Church.—Character of Warham.—Of Wolsey, and his  
attempt to gain the Papedom.—Election of Clement VII.—His  
quarrel with the Emperor Charles V. and Imprisonment.—His  
escape to Orvieto.—Suit of Henry VIII. in the Consistory of Rome  
for a Divorce from Catherine of Arragon.—State of that Question.—  
A Commission of Legation to try the Cause in England.—Progress  
of the Trial, and Avocation of the Cause to Rome. 36

### CHAPTER III.

- Indignation of Henry.—Disgrace of Wolsey.—Rise of Cranmer.—He  
writes a Treatise in favour of the Divorce.—Decisions of the English  
Universities in its favour; and of many foreign Universities; and  
of many eminent individuals.—Address of the English Nobility and

- Gentry to the Pope.—The Pope's Rescript.—Death of Wolsey.—Parliament and Convocation assembled.—The Clergy involved in a *Præmunire*.—Statutes enacted in prejudice of the Papal Authority.—Remonstrance of Henry to the Pope.—Its consequences.—Resignation of Sir Thomas More.—Death of Warham. 65

#### CHAPTER IV.

- Promotion of Cranmer to the Primacy.—Previous Marriage of Henry with Anne Boleyn.—Statute against Appeals.—Convocation decides against the validity of Catherine's Marriage.—Cranmer pronounces the sentence of Divorce, and confirms the Marriage of Anne Boleyn.—Proceedings at Rome.—Statutes passed in Parliament against the Papal Authority.—Acts confirming the King's Supremacy, and regulating the Succession.—Execution of Fisher and More. 93

#### CHAPTER V.

- Division of the Ecclesiastical State into Secular and Monastic.—The Monastic Orders, Military and Religious.—Religious Orders subdivided into Monks, Canons, and Friars.—Dissolution of the smaller Monasteries, and consequent Rebellion. The greater Abbeys surrendered, and the Surrender confirmed by Law.—Chantryes and free Chapels given to the King.—Application of the Monastic Property.—New Bishoprics erected.—Cathedral Chapters founded.—General Reflections on the policy and justice of the measure. 122

#### CHAPTER VI.

- Progress of the Reformation with respect to Doctrine.—Prelates divided.—Conduct of Cranmer.—Henry refuses to adopt the Confession of Augsburgh, and to join the Smalcaldian League.—Translation of the Bible begun.—Formularies. 1. King's Primer; 2. Articles of Religion; 3. Institution of a Christian Man.—Translation of the Bible completed.—Divisions of the Clergy on the Sacraments and the Corporal Presence.—Disputation of Alesius, and of Lambert.—Statute of the Six Articles. 159

## CHAPTER VII.

Friendship of Henry towards Cranmer.—Persecution of the Reformers.—Bible reprinted, with a Preface by Cranmer.—Promotion of Boner, and his cooperation in the Reformation.—Speech of Cromwell to the Parliament, and his fall.—Office of Ecclesiastical Vicegerent abolished.—Committee for revising the Ceremonies of the Church, and an Account of the *Rationale*.—Committee for setting forth an Exposition of Christian Doctrine, and an Account of the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition*.—Last Years of Henry the Eighth.

188

## CHAPTER VIII.

Character of Edward VI.—Earl of Hertford created Duke of Somerset and Protector.—Coronation of Edward, and Address by Cranmer.—The Lord Chancellor removed.—Somerset holds the Protectorate by Letters-Patent.—Prelates favourable to the Reformation.—Character of Ridley.—Royal Visitation.—First Book of Homilies.—Erasmus's Paraphrase.—Gardiner's opposition.—Proceedings in Parliament and in Convocation.—Proclamation.—New Communion Office.—Gardiner sent to the Tower.—First Catechism of Edward VI.—First Service Book.

213

## CHAPTER IX.

Interference of the Foreign Reformers.—Letter of Calvin to Somerset, and of Melancthon to Cranmer.—Bucer and Fagius arrive in England, and are appointed to Theological Professorships at Cambridge.—John Alasco.—Community at Glastonbury.—Martyr is appointed Professor of Divinity at Oxford.—Disputations at Oxford and Cambridge on the Corporal Presence.—Progress of the Anabaptists and Gospellers.—Joan Bocher, or Joan of Kent.—Rebellions in various parts of England.—Deprivation of Boner.—Fall of Somerset.—New Acts Ecclesiastical.—Deprivation of Gardiner.—Consecration of Hooper, and Dispute concerning the Vestments.—Dispute concerning Altars and Tables.

240

## CHAPTER X.

- Bucer's Animadversions on the Common Prayer.—His Death and Character.—Second Service Book of Edward VI.—Psalmody.—Articles of Religion.—Second Catechism of Edward VI.—*Reformatio Legum.* 266

## CHAPTER XI.

- Influence of Northumberland, and Settlement of the Crown by Edward on Lady Jane Grey.—Conduct of Cranmer.—Death of Edward.—Succession of Mary.—Unsuccessful effort of Northumberland to place Lady Jane Grey on the Throne.—His Trial and Execution.—The deprived Bishops restored.—Gardiner made Lord Chancellor.—Cranmer and other Protestant Bishops sent to the Tower.—Coronation of Mary.—Parliament assembles, and confirms the Queen's Legitimacy.—Statutes of Edward VI. concerning Religion repealed.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Reginald Pole appointed Legate by Paul III.—Wyatt's Rebellion, and Execution of Jane Grey.—Marriage of Mary with Philip, son of the Emperor Charles V. 296

## CHAPTER XII.

- Royal Injunction for the re-establishment of the Romish Religion.—Protestant Bishops and Clergy deprived.—Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer sent to Oxford.—Disputation held there on the Corporal Presence.—Projected Disputation at Cambridge defeated.—Philip arrives in England.—Marriage with Mary solemnized.—Third Parliament of Mary.—Pole's Attainder reversed.—Reconciliation of England to the See of Rome.—Policy of Pole and Gardiner.—Statutes against Heresy revived. 326

## CHAPTER XIII.

- The Marian Persecution.—Its duration.—Numbers who suffered.—Rogers, the Protomartyr in the Protestant Cause.—Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester.—Sanders and Taylor.—Gardiner hesitates.—Ferrar, Bishop of Saint David's.—Bradford, and his Controversy with his

Fellow-Prisoners concerning Predestination.—Cranmer cited to appear before the Pope's Sub-Delegate.—Ridley and Latimer before the Representative of Cardinal Pole.—Death of Ridley and Latimer.—Death of Gardiner.—Philpot executed.—Recantation and Death of Cranmer.—Pole succeeds to the See of Canterbury.—Ecclesiastical Administration of Pole.—Death of Mary and of Pole. 350

## CHAPTER XIV.

Of the exiled Church of England.—Number of the Exiles.—Characters of the principal Divines.—Poinet.—Coverdale.—Cox.—Jewel.—Troubles at Frankfort.—Knoxians and Coxians.—Intelligence of the Death of Mary.—Return of the Exiles at the Accession of Elizabeth.

387

## CHAPTER XV.

Policy of Elizabeth.—Notification of her Succession to the different Courts of Europe.—Protestants and Papists associated in the Privy Council.—Prisoners on account of Religion released.—Coronation of the Queen.—Meeting of Parliament.—Act of Supremacy, and Court of High Commission.—Act of Uniformity.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Disputation in Westminster Abbey.—Liturgy of Edward the Sixth, with some modifications, restored.—Appointment of Parker to the See of Canterbury, and his Consecration.—Protestant Episcopacy restored.—Treatment of the Romish Prelates. 414

## CHAPTER XVI.

Royal Visitation and Injunctions.—Articles of Religion agreed on by the Archbishop and Bishops till the Meeting of Convocation.—Jewel's Sermon at Saint Paul's Cross.—Conduct of the Popes Paul IV. and Pius IV.—Second Parliament of Elizabeth.—Statute of Assurance.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.—Proceedings of the Lower House with regard to Ceremonies.—Nowell's Catechism.—Jewel's Apology.—Genevan Bible.—Bishops' Bible. 441

## CHAPTER XVII.

Origin and progress of Puritanism.—Cecil's Address to the Queen.—Many of the Clergy refuse to wear the Habits.—Case of Samson and Humfreys.—Their correspondence with the foreign Reformers.—Puritans take advantage of a Papal Bull to the University of Cambridge, and are licensed as Preachers.—First separation of the Puritans from the Church.—Conduct of the See of Rome.—Rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.—Bull of Pius the Fifth.—Increase of Puritanism.—Thomas Cartwright.—Parliament and Convocation meet.—Proceedings in both.—Jewel's Sermon at Saint Paul's Cross against the Puritans.—Death of Jewel. 466

## CHAPTER XVIII.

Different Sects of the Puritans.—Their influence in the Council, and in the House of Commons.—First Admonition to Parliament by Field and Wilcox.—Second Admonition to Parliament by Cartwright.—Whitgift's Controversy with Cartwright.—First Presbyterian Congregation at Wandsworth.—Puritans attempt to join the foreign Congregations.—Prophesings of the Clergy.—Parker's Death.—Grindal's Succession.—Refuses to suppress the Prophesings, and is suspended.—Parliament meets, and enacts Penal Statutes against Papists and Puritans.—Further Dissensions.—Death of Grindal, and Succession of Whitgift.—He revives the Discipline of the Church.—Puritans propose their Scheme of Discipline in Parliament, but it is rejected.—Speech of the Queen at the Prorogation of Parliament. 492

## CHAPTER XIX.

Application of the Puritans to the Convocation and to Whitgift, for Relief.—Dangers to the Government.—Spanish Armada.—Conduct of the Papists and Puritans.—Martin Marprelate.—Answers by Bridges and Cooper.—New Parliament.—Severe penal Laws passed.—Of the Barrowists, and the Execution of their Leaders.—Penry's Character and Death.—Writings of the English Divines against Puritanism.—HOOKER'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY. 520

## CHAPTER XX.

Progress of doctrinal Calvinism.—Disputes at Cambridge.—Pre-destinarian Controversy.—Lambeth Articles.—Schism between the Jesuits and Seculars.—Death of Elizabeth.—Accession of James.—State of the Scottish Church.—Whitgift sends Nevil into Scotland.—Millenary Petition.—Hampton Court Conference. 549



HISTORY  
OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

CHAPTER I.

Preliminary View of the English Church before the Reformation.—Divided into three eras—I. The Anglo-Saxon Church, from the time of Augustine to the Conquest—II. From the Norman Conquest to the Reign of King John—III. From Magna Charta to the Reformation.

THE Reformation of the Church of England was distinguished from that of the other Protestant Churches of Europe, in its origin, in its progress, and in its extent. In the one case, a high-spirited and absolute monarch, encountering no other opposition than from his own prejudices, emancipated himself from the papal authority, which had once been the object of his obsequious deference and zealous support. In the other case, an obscure individual, educated in monastic retirement, sustained by native intrepidity, and aided by popular favour, stood forward to combat not only the spiritual power of the Romish see, but the hostility of those despotic princes who were devoted to its interests. Henry the Eighth prepared the way for the English Reformation by subverting the papal jurisdiction, while he sincerely believed, and rigorously enforced, the fundamental tenets of the

papal creed. Luther, the controversial antagonist of Henry, commenced by impugning the principal doctrines of the Romish Church, before he proceeded to separate himself from its communion. The English Reformers, after the death of Henry, entered into an examination of the doctrine and discipline of that Church from which they separated, without an undistinguishing antipathy towards either, and retained both, as far as they agreed with the rules of Scripture and the practice of primitive Christianity. The foreign Reformers, animated by the example of Luther, and by indignation against the corruptions of the see of Rome, seceded as far as possible from its doctrine, its polity, and its ritual, without sacrificing the essentials of the Christian faith.

To pursue this comparison through all its points of difference, and to deduce its legitimate inferences, is the province of theological disquisition, rather than of ecclesiastical history. But that the nature and effects of the Reformation may be historically understood, some knowledge should be obtained of the previous state of the Christian world. It is for this reason that a general and succinct account of the English Church, while under the dominion of the see of Rome, is necessary to render a narrative of its subsequent vicissitudes not only interesting but intelligible.

On the assumption that Christianity was introduced into the British isles, if not by the Apostles themselves, at least by their immediate successors, an unquestionable fact may be stated, that Christian knowledge was retained by the aboriginal inhabitants when their Saxon conquerors were enveloped in barbarism and idolatry. While Wales, Scotland, and Ireland were luminaries, " whence savage clans and roving barbarians derived the benefits of knowledge and the blessings of religion;" among their Saxon neighbours of the south of England the light of the Gospel was entirely extinguished. When Augustine un-

dertook his mission, it does not appear that among all the Saxons there was a single person professing Christianity<sup>a</sup>.

The Bishops of Rome had for some time meditated the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon nation before the pious design could be accomplished. Pope Gregory, surnamed the Great, at length found a circumstance favourable to his wish, in the marriage of Bertha, a daughter of Charibert, King of the Franks, to Ethelbert, the reigning monarch of Kent. Among the ancient nations of Germany the female sex was believed to be peculiarly sacred, and favoured with more frequent revelations of the Divine will. Women were therefore heard with uncommon attention in all deliberations that concerned religion<sup>b</sup>.

By the influence of Bertha, seconded by the persuasions of the Christian priests who accompanied her, Ethelbert expressed a disposition to renounce idolatry, and to embrace the religion of his Queen. This disposition induced Pope Gregory to send Augustine, a prior of a Benedictine monastery at Rheims, with forty of the fraternity, into the dominions of the Kentish King. They entered Canterbury in procession; and the King heard them in the open air, in order to defeat, on a principle of Druidical superstition, the effect of their enchantments. Ethelbert was among the first of their converts; and a large portion of the nobles followed the example of their Prince. Augustine pursued his pious labours with equal zeal and success. He opened seminaries of learning, and erected edifices for religious worship. Having received episcopal consecration from the Bishop of Arles, he was invested by Pope Gregory with the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and was constituted the first Archbishop of Canterbury.

<sup>a</sup> Burke's Abridgment of English History, book ii. c. i. p. 255.

<sup>b</sup> Tacitus de Mor. German. c. viii.

Augustine, when raised to the metropolitan see of England, was not unmindful of the religious community to which he had formerly belonged. The order of Benedict had been instituted in the beginning of the sixth century, and fully merited that preeminence which it long obtained among the other religious orders. According to the rule of its founder, its objects were of enlarged utility: its members were subjected to a milder discipline than generally prevailed among other monastics; and they were enjoined to employ the time unoccupied by devotional exercises in the cultivation of literature and the education of youth. Pope Gregory, the patron of Augustine, had been himself a Benedictine; and the new Archbishop easily obtained a papal bull, conferring peculiar privileges on a Benedictine monastery, which he had founded in the city of Canterbury, and called after his own name. Thus, both episcopacy and monachism were introduced into the kingdom of Ethelbert; and the period of their introduction properly constitutes the era of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

I. As the newly-founded ecclesiastical establishment emanated from Rome, it was the aim of the apostolic see to rivet the connexion between the two Churches. The dignity and the precedence annexed to the primacy of England by Gregory were confirmed by succeeding Pontiffs. In accordance with the imperfect geography of those times, which described the inhabitants of the British isles as “penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos,” the Archbishop of Canterbury, among his other titles, was styled “papa alterius orbis.” An inherent legatine power was vested in his office, and at general councils he was seated at the right foot of the Pope. The great ecclesiastical chair of this kingdom, for nearly a century after the death of Augustine, was filled by foreigners. Among these, Theodorus, the seventh Archbishop, deserves notice, as having contributed a valuable accession to the originally slender stock of Saxon literature. This Prelate was by birth a Greek,

and he first introduced the study of his native language into the island by founding a school at Canterbury<sup>c</sup>. 669

Christianity having once taken root in the kingdom of Kent, spread itself with rapidity throughout the other kingdoms of the Saxon Heptarchy. Before the reduction of these states into one monarchy, the see of York was 629 established, and its jurisdiction comprised not only the kingdom of Northumbria, but extended into Scotland. The Northumbrian kingdom, as soon as it was converted, began to emulate, if not to surpass, the southern states. While the latter derived all their Christian knowledge immediately from Rome, the former had a source of intellectual and religious light in another and more extraordinary quarter. The island of Icolmkill, or Iona, then renowned for the rigour of its ascetic discipline, and for its devotedness to the abstruse sciences, had a considerable share in forming the institutions of the Northumbrians. Northumbria was, if possible, more indebted to another island, lying off the northern extremity of its coast, called Landisfarn, now Holy Island, which was at that time the most flourishing monastery in Europe. Splendid as is the fame of Iona, the names of almost all its literary men have perished<sup>d</sup>; but of Landisfarn, the works of the Venerable Bede still attest the merited reputation. Though this father of Saxon learning, and ornament of the Saxon Church, was not a genius of the highest order, yet it is impossible to refuse him the praise of unwearied diligence, and a generous thirst of knowledge.

The ancient British Church, by whomsoever planted, was a stranger to the Bishop of Rome and his pretended authority<sup>e</sup>. The Anglo-Saxon Church, though planted by

<sup>c</sup> Burke's Abridg. Eng. Hist. b. ii. c. ii. p. 275.

<sup>d</sup> There is an Autograph MS. of St. Columbkille in the Library of Trin. Coll. Dublin: and there are works by Adamnan, eighth Abbot of Iona, and by others still in existence.

<sup>e</sup> Blackstone's Com. b. iv. c. 8. p. 104.

the Popes, and though showing a deference to the Romish see, was far from obeying its mandates with blind submission. After the reduction of the Heptarchy, the ecclesiastical as well as the civil government acquired uniformity and consistence; and while the sovereignty of England continued in the Saxon line, the people were governed by their own institutions. Some of these were the offspring of a rude and barbarous policy; but others are justly cherished with fondness, and regarded with veneration.

The division of England into counties has been assigned to Alfred, and the judicature which he established in these districts was of a peculiar kind. The association of the Bishop and Earl in the same court prevented any collision between the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction. In ecclesiastical causes, the Bishop sat as judge, while the Earl, as his coadjutor, gave effect to spiritual censures: in civil causes, the Earl presided, and the Bishop, as his assistant, conferred solemnity on the infliction of temporal penalties.

Episcopacy was fully recognised in the Saxon Church as of divine institution, and its peculiar functions were accurately discriminated. It was such an episcopacy as obtained in the pure and primitive age of Christianity; not of an absolute but moderate nature. In the public ministration of divine offices, the highest in point of dignity was the consecration of the Lord's Supper; and this might be performed by a Priest as well as by a Bishop: but to the Bishop alone belonged the right of jurisdiction, of conferring Orders, of Confirmation, and of spiritual superintendence<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>f</sup> Haud pluris interest inter missalem presbyterum et episcopum, quam quod episcopus constitutus sit ad ordinationes conferendas, et ad visitandum, seu ad inspiciendum, curandumque ea quae ad Deum pertinent (Dei jura), quod nimiæ crederetur multitudini si omnis Presbyter hoc idem faceret. Ambo siquidem unum tenent eundemque ordinem, quamvis dignior sit illa pars episcopi.—Spel. Con. vol. i. Can. Aelf. p. 576.

The submission of the priesthood to the Saxon Bishops was, like that of the Bishops to the see of Rome, limited; and its independence was secured by the division of England into parishes. Not only the payment of tithes for the maintenance of a Christian Ministry was adopted as a part of the general law of the Church, and was recognised in England during the Heptarchy, but the division of parishes and the endowment of churches commenced under the Saxon constitution. Before the time of Edward the Confessor, the parochial boundaries were so far ascertained, that every man might be traced to the parish to which he belonged. Tithes were no longer paid to the Bishop of the diocese, and distributed by him as universal incumbent; but were appropriated to the maintenance of the Priest in whose parish they accrued, and he thenceforth obtained a free tenure in his benefice<sup>s</sup>.

II. The Conquest, since it not only changed the line of kings, but the whole polity of the English kingdom, properly constitutes the second era in the history of its Church. Till this event, we read of no civil authority claimed by the Pope in these kingdoms<sup>h</sup>: but the reigning Pontiff, Alexander the Second, having favoured William, in his projected invasion, by blessing his host and consecrating his banners, his successor, Gregory the Seventh, seized the opportunity of advancing a claim to temporal dominion. The haughty and fearless nature of the Conqueror alone prevented, on this occasion, a sacrifice of the national independence and the regal privileges. When Gregory demanded from William the arrears of the Peter-pence<sup>i</sup>, and at the same time required homage for the

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. p. 182.

<sup>h</sup> Blackstone's Com. b. iv. c. 8. with Coleridge's note.

<sup>i</sup> Peter-pence, so called from being collected on the feast of Saint Peter in vinculis. This tax was imposed by Ina, king of the West Saxons, in 725, and at last became general. It was intended originally for the support of an English College at Rome, but was afterwards appropriated by the Popes.

English dominions as a fief of the holy see, the tribute was paid, but the homage was refused: the warlike monarch answered, that he held the kingdom of England of God only and his own sword.

Yet, while the personal character of the Conqueror was a security against any sacrifice of national independence, he prepared the way for papal usurpation under his more imbecile successors. By him the whole system of Saxon jurisprudence was modelled according to the genius of his Norman subjects. In the beginning of his reign he manifested a disposition to leave the kingdom in the possession of its ancient institutions. At Berkhamstead, in the presence of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, he took a solemn oath to observe the good and approved laws of the realm, particularly those of Edward the Confessor, and at the same time issued a mandate, that twelve Saxons in each county should make inquiry, and certify what these laws were.

When the result of this inquiry was laid before William, he no longer concealed his inclination to adopt the Danish laws, as being more conformable to those of Normandy. The circumstance was no sooner perceived by the English, than they adopted the language of alarm and supplication: they besought their prince not to violate his late solemn engagement, but to confirm their laws as left by Edward the Confessor. To this supplication William at length consented; and in a general council solemnly ordained that the laws of Edward, with such alterations and additions as he himself had made, should in all things be observed.

Though the system of Saxon jurisprudence was thus confirmed, and continued to be the basis of the common law, yet the alterations soon became material. One of the most important was the separation of the ecclesiastical from the civil judicature. By an ordinance of the Conqueror, the Bishop, with all ecclesiastical causes, was

separated from the Earl; and the Earl, acquiring a feudal character, began to hold his county court after the manner of the feudal lords. This separation ingratiated William with the popish clergy, and augmented their power. They were now exempted from the secular authority; and, as all the learning of the times was engrossed by them, they obtained a decided superiority in the administration of the laws<sup>k</sup>.

The Saxon Prelates having been deprived by William, the Bishoprics were filled by Normans and Italians, men unconnected with the civil state in which they lived, and devoted to a foreign power. In the synod which was convened for the purpose of deposing Stigand, and substituting Lanfranc in his room, the Pope's legate is said to have presided for the first time in England<sup>l</sup>.

William Rufus in no instance deviated from the policy of his father, and in many instances extended it: but his brother and successor, Henry the First, on his accession, attempted to restore the laws of Edward the Confessor. He united for a time the civil and ecclesiastical courts; but the union was soon dissolved, and the dissolution was perpetuated by the introduction of the pontifical code, or what is commonly termed the canon law.

The Canon law first known in England was formed by the permission and under the control of the civil government. Such a law was grounded on prescription, and supported by arguments of expediency. The existence of a Church, with the gradation and subordination of governors and governed, necessarily implies a code of regulations for the direction of its various functionaries. This being admitted, a body of canonical jurisprudence had been suffered to grow up into maturity.

In a national synod assembled in England in the seventh century, the ancient canonical code of the Romish Church

<sup>k</sup> Reeves's Hist. of Eng. Law, part i. c. i. p. 45.

<sup>l</sup> Burke's Abridg. of Eng. Hist. b. iii. c. ii. p. 384.

was distinctly recognised by the Clergy. It appears also that William the Conqueror, with the advice and assent of his great council, revised and reformed the ecclesiastical laws then in use<sup>m</sup>. These ancient canons were not hostile to regal prerogative or to civil liberty, and they were therefore received both by the King and people without reluctance.

In the reign of Henry the First, a compilation of canon law was made by Ivo de Chartres, containing many extravagant opinions, calculated to advance the dominion of the Pope, and the pretensions of the Clergy. But, in the year 1151, about fourteen years after the date which vulgar opinion has assigned for the discovery of the Pandects of Justinian at Amalfi, a complete body or digest of canon law was made by Gratian, a Benedictine monk of Bologna. This digest was a collection of opinions and decisions, extracted from sayings of the fathers, determinations of councils, and, above all, from decretal epistles of popes, tending to exalt the ecclesiastical state, and to exempt the Clergy from secular subordination. This volume, known by the title of The Decrees, emulated the Pandects of Justinian both in its composition and arrangement. The applause which this book received from the see of Rome, and from the Clergy, soon raised its estimation above all former collections; and it afterwards became the grand' code of ecclesiastical law on 'which the popish hierarchy rested its extravagant claims.

The resemblance of the Decrees of Gratian to the Pandects was afterwards extended to the other parts of the imperial code; and as the civil law consisted of four parts, so the canon law had a quadruple division<sup>n</sup>. The canon

<sup>m</sup> Wilkins, Leg. Ang. Sax. p. 230.

<sup>n</sup> An *Institute* of canon law was drawn up by John Lancelot, in the pontificate of Paul IV., to correspond with the *Institutes* of Justinian; Gratian's *Decrees* answered to the *Digest* or *Pandects*; the *Decretals* answered to the *Code*; and the *Extravagants* of Pope John XXII.

and civil law had always been studied by the same persons, and the connexion was now drawn more closely. Like the imperial and papal powers, they afforded to each other a mutual support; and though differing in some minute particulars, they agreed in essential points. They had the same professors; and the union of a canonist and a civilian was necessary to the formation of an accomplished Churchman<sup>o</sup>.

The two principal subjects of canonical legislation were matrimonial and testamentary; subjects comprehending no inconsiderable portion of the business of human life. With the first were connected all questions of legitimacy and divorce: with the last, the cognizance of all bequests and legacies, together with the administration of the property of intestates. The canon law also determined the rights of investiture to ecclesiastical benefices, and had a control over tithes, that fruitful source of ecclesiastical revenue.

The crimes and offences punishable by the ecclesiastical court, or, as it was commonly called, the Court Christian, were divided into such as were contrary to piety, to justice, and to sobriety; and it is impossible to name any crime which may not be included under one of these three divisions. When all the matters of canonical jurisdiction are enumerated, the power of the ecclesiastical court will appear truly formidable. Notwithstanding the struggles of English kings, of parliaments, and of the common lawyers, the canonists succeeded in establishing more than two-thirds of the pontifical law<sup>p</sup>.

In addition to the code of canon law, in which the last appeal was to the supreme Pontiff, England was governed in ecclesiastical matters by the provincial constitutions. completed the analogy, by imitating the *Novels*.—Taylor's Elements of Civil Law. Introd.

<sup>o</sup> “ Nullus clericus nisi causidicus.”—William of Malmesbury.

<sup>p</sup> Reeves's Hist. of Eng. Law, part i. c. i. p. 47.

These were a collection of canons, made by successive Archbishops of Canterbury, for the regulation of their own province, and, since they were afterwards adopted by the province of York, for the government of the national Church. They were enacted by the Archbishops, sometimes in their legatine, and sometimes in their provincial, capacity. But the obligation of these provincial constitutions was comparatively weak; for whenever they were defective, or doubtful, or contradictory, they were to be supplied, resolved, and determined, by the higher authority of the pontifical law<sup>q</sup>.

The ‘Constitutions’ enacted by the Archbishops of Canterbury, whether as metropolitans of the English Church or as legates of the Pope, seldom excited complaint; but the pontifical law, on its first introduction, gave rise to jealousy and apprehension. When Vacarius, an eminent canonist and civilian, came into England, and, towards the end of the reign of Stephen, began to read his Lectures at Oxford, the King, alarmed at the consequences to which these new doctrines might lead, is said to have issued a prohibition, forbidding his subjects to read any books on the canon law. This prohibition could not be directed against the ancient canon law, which had been ratified by the Saxon monarchs, but against the novel and dangerous opinions contained in the collection first made by Ivo de Chartres, and afterwards completed by Gratian.

From the time of the promulgation of the pontifical code, must be fixed the commencement of the contests between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, by which the kingdom was constantly distracted. It was not until the publication of Gratian’s decrees that the separate establishment of ecclesiastical judicature gained much

<sup>q</sup> The provincial ‘constitutions’ were digested and published with a commentary, from the time of Lanfranc to the middle of the fifteenth century, by that celebrated canonist Lynwode.

strength, or that its exclusive jurisdiction was an object of dislike and suspicion.

The progress of papal usurpation, during the reigns of the first Henry and Stephen, ought therefore to be distinctly marked, in its reference to the introduction of the canon law. The title of Henry to the throne was doubtful, and he found it necessary by concession to gain the support of his clergy; the title of Stephen was worse than doubtful, and his submission to the ecclesiastical power was still more implicit.

Until the time of Henry, every Bishop elect received investiture of his temporalities from the King, of whom all Bishops held their lands as baronies. Taken in this view, the bishoprics partook of the feudal nature as far as they were subjects capable of it. Homage and fealty were required from the Bishop to the King, who, in return, gave to the Bishop livery and seisin of the temporalities of the bishopric by the delivery of a ring and staff. This mode of investiture was not confined to England; it was general throughout Christendom; and Pope Adrian confirmed this privilege to Charlemagne by an express grant.

But when the papal pretensions increased, a Council at Rome strictly forbade the Clergy to receive investitures from laymen, or to do them homage. Although vigorously attacked, Henry, with great resolution, maintained the rights of his crown with regard to investitures: but the uncertain tenure of his authority obliged him first to temporize, and afterwards to yield. A compromise was settled, which, though apparently of no importance, was a substantial accession to the power of the Romish see. Henry, after the example of the other part of the Western Church, yielded the ring and crosier, reserving the rights of fealty and homage. But the advantage gained by the Pope was material. Episcopal consecration was incomplete before the delivery of the ring and crosier, and the power of withholding these symbols of the pastoral autho-

rity operated as a prohibition in an early stage of the election.

In the reign of Stephen, the Clergy made large advances towards complete independence of the civil government. His brother was Bishop of Winchester, and chief justiciary of the kingdom; and through the influence of this Prelate, Stephen was elected, in prejudice of the lawful heir. In the midst of the civil wars which followed, the Clergy were not unmindful of extending their authority, and the spiritual court assumed a jurisdiction over a breach of faith in civil contracts. This was the boldest step which that tribunal ever made to enlarge its powers, and was calculated to draw under its cognizance most of the transactions of civil life.

The death of Stephen left an undisputed title for the first time since the death of Edward the Confessor. Henry the Second, descended equally from the Norman Conqueror and the old English Kings, adopted by Stephen, and acknowledged by the Barons, united in himself every kind of title<sup>r</sup>. Possessed of all these advantages, the great aim of his policy was to break the power of his Clergy, which each of his predecessors had alternately striven to raise and to depress.

The Constitutions of Clarendon (1164) were wisely designed to fix the limits of the secular and ecclesiastical judicature, and formed a basis on which these separate jurisdictions might have been founded, without diminution of the regal authority. But the articles which were enacted at that famous council prove at once the increasing influence and the extravagant pretensions of the ecclesiastical state. Of the sixteen articles there agreed on, ten were considered by the see of Rome as so hostile to the rights of the Clergy, that Pope Alexander the Third passed a solemn condemnation on them; the other six he tolerated, not as good, but as less evil. Henry, in spite of the papal censure, pro-

<sup>r</sup> Burke's Abridg. of Eng. History, b. iii. c. vi. p. 451.

cured a confirmation of these articles in a council at Northampton; but, after his first spirited opposition, pusillanimous concession followed. Overcome with shame for the murder of Becket, in which he was implicated, though he did not explicitly concur with the demands of the papacy, yet he desisted from executing those laws for which he had so long contended. The statutes of Clarendon were unrepealed<sup>s</sup>, but they were suspended by a temporizing connivance of the executive power.

The privileges which the Clergy had established under Henry the Second were strengthened in the reigns of the two monarchs and brothers who succeeded. Richard the First, whose thirst for military glory was his strongest passion, supplied the sums necessary for his expedition to the Holy Land by the sale of the demesnes of the crown, and of every office under it. The Clergy, whose wealth and policy enabled them to take advantage of his necessities, were generally the purchasers of both. But Richard, while he employed these resources in acquiring empty renown, was laid under a stronger obligation to his Clergy. It was to ecclesiastical liberality that he was principally indebted for his ransom. The most favoured religious orders were charged on this occasion, and even the most sacred reliques were not spared. This generous conduct was not unrewarded: the Clergy had every thing to hope from the gratitude of their King, and they were not disappointed in their expectations.

The reign of John is one of the most remarkable in English history, if we consider the unforeseen revolutions by which it was distinguished. The hereditary title of this Prince was untenable, and the Clergy took advantage of the circumstance to establish an axiom that the crown was

<sup>s</sup> This is doubtful. It has been said that the Constitutions of Clarendon were repealed. See Reeves's Hist. Eng. Law, part i. c. i. p. 56, 57.

elective. This was publicly affirmed by Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, at the coronation; and John, by accepting the sovereignty, tacitly admitted its validity. Authority acquired on a tenure so fragile was exercised in such a manner as to increase its original insecurity. John was alike hated for the tyranny of his government and the vices of his private life. Attacked by the king of France, detested by his nobles and people, he wanted only the hostility of the Church to complete his ruin. An occasion soon offered, by which this heaviest calamity was added to his other difficulties. On the death of Hubert, the monks of Canterbury, without asking the royal license, or waiting for the concurrence of the provincial Bishops, elected Reginald, their subprior, into the vacancy: the person thus elected immediately proceeded to Rome; but his vanity prematurely revealed the secret. The King, provoked at the transaction, inflicted a severe punishment on the whole monastery; the sounder part, however, of its members pacified their offended Prince by submission. They elected the Bishop of Norwich, with the usual licence and concurrence, and sent fourteen of their body to Rome, to pray that the first election might be cancelled and the last confirmed. Nothing could be more gratifying to the Popes than such appeals; for they knew that contending parties agree in aggrandizing that authority from which they expect a confirmation of their own.

Innocent the Third, the reigning Pontiff, decided that the right of election was in the monks; but that their first election of Reginald was informal, and that their second election of the Bishop of Norwich was void, because made before the first was annulled. In consequence of these informalities, and by virtue of the canon law, the pope, as universal metropolitan, ordered the deputies of Canterbury, then at Rome, to proceed to a new election. At the same time he recommended Stephen Langton, their countryman, a person of great learning and irreproachable morals. This

authoritative request the monks could not oppose; they murmured and submitted.

In England this proceeding was not so easily ratified. John drove the monks of Canterbury from their monastery, and seized their revenues; but Rome had not made so bold a step with an intention to recede. On the refusal of the King to admit Langton, the kingdom was laid under an interdict; the churches were shut, the dead were denied Christian burial, and the living deprived of all spiritual consolation. At length the sentence of excommunication was fulminated against John; his English subjects were released from their oath of allegiance; he was formally deposed from his throne; and Philip, King of France, was invited to take possession of the forfeited crown.

The unhappy King, wounded by the consciousness of his crimes, hated by his subjects, and excommunicated by the Pope, was filled with distraction; and the Pontiff was willing to negotiate with an adversary so humbled. An embassy was sent to England, and Pandulph, the legate, was entrusted with the management of the treaty. The artful ecclesiastic drew John on from concession to concession. Langton was to be established in the archiepiscopal chair; the monks of Canterbury, and other deprived ecclesiastics, were to be restored, and a full indemnification was to be made for all their losses. But when the King, for so complete a submission, expected absolution, the legate declared, that there was no way to appease God and the Church, but to resign his crown to the holy see. From that sacred authority he should receive it again, purified from its former stains, and hold it in future by homage and an annual tribute. Surrounded by a complication of difficulties, John saw no other method of extricating himself than by submission. In the presence of a numerous assemblage of his Peers and Prelates, who turned their eyes from the ignominious sight, he formally resigned his crown, and paid his homage. The last mark

of disgrace was not spared. The legate spurned with his foot the proffered tribute, and suffered the crown to remain a long time on the ground before it was restored to the degraded owner.

III. Hitherto the papal power had been progressive; but it had now reached its zenith: here we approach a third period in the history of the English Church, the era of the declension of Roman influence.

The first check which the see of Rome received, proceeded from a quarter where opposition could never have been expected. Whether we regard the station of Cardinal Langton, or his personal obligations to the Pope, it might be thought that he would have shown himself the intrepid assertor of papal supremacy. But Langton was a true patriot, and his designs for the improvement of the English constitution were marked by liberality and prudence. If Becket had opposed the King through the Pope, Langton opposed the Pope through the King. In the oath which he administered to John on his absolution, he did not confine himself to ecclesiastical grievances, but extended the oath to the abuses of civil government. John solemnly promised to raise no tax without the consent of his great council, and to punish no man but by the judgment of his court.

John swore, and violated his oath; but he found that his power of tyrannising was at an end. He had no foreign alliance among the temporal powers, and he threw himself on the protection of the Pope. He was content to purchase the papal protection by a second resignation of his crown. But Langton, at the head of the friends of civil freedom, loudly exclaimed at this indignity, protested against the resignation, and laid his protestation on the altar.

In vain had John recourse to arms: the Barons raised forces, and appointed a leader by the title of Marshal of the army of God and holy Church. The Marshal assumed all the prerogatives of royalty; issued writs summoning

the nobles to join the army, threatening equally those who actively adhered to the King, and those who betrayed an indifference to the sacred cause by neutrality. The instrument which the King was compelled to sign is well known by the name of MAGNA CHARTA. Deservedly would it have merited this appellation, and justly would it have been endeared to posterity, if it had contained only this single sentence: “*ANGLICANA ECCLESIA LIBERA SIT.*”

As the first check to the papal pretensions arose from the Barons, under the direction and encouragement of an English Archbishop of Canterbury, the second proceeded from the temporal Barons, in opposition to the spiritual Lords. The Barons were licentious in their lives, and their castles were filled with their illegitimate offspring. The surname of bastard in the feudal times was not a dishonourable designation. By the civil as well as by the canon law<sup>t</sup>, subsequent marriage conferred legitimacy on any previous issue, and rendered it capable of inheritance; while the common law, transmitted from the Saxon age through the Norman and Plantagenet lines, stamped on illegitimacy an indelible stain. The Bishops, as partisans of the Pope, were anxious to introduce the whole code of the pontifical law, and selected this article as best fitted to effect their purpose. They proposed to the Barons met in Parliament, that issue born before wedlock should be legitimate; but the Barons had sufficient discernment to reject the proposition, however gratifying, and patriotically sacrificed their inclinations to preserve the liberties of their country. Their answer to the proposal of the Bishops was conveyed in that phrase of large and convenient application: “*No-LUMUS LEGES ANGLIÆ MUTARI<sup>u</sup>.*”

<sup>t</sup> It was a Constitution of Pope Alexander: it is now the law of Scotland.

<sup>u</sup> “*Rogaverunt omnes episcopi ut consentirent quod nati ante matrimonium essent legitimi, et omnes comites et barones unâ voce responderunt quod nolunt leges Angliæ mutari.*” Coke’s First Part of the Inst. &c. vol. i. lib. iii. c. 6. §. 400.

In the preceding instances, the opposition to ecclesiastical usurpation proceeded from the Barons, unaided by the Crown; but in the next instance, it originated in the Monarch himself. Edward the First, to whom the laws of England are so much indebted that he has been called the English Justinian, had the honour of interposing the regal power to withstand the encroachments of the Romish see. His projects were long in arriving at maturity; their effects at first were scarcely perceptible, and probably were not contemplated even by himself; but they contained within them the germ of the Reformation.

It is in his reign that the rude outline of an English Convocation is first discernible. Synods of the higher clergy, both secular and monastic, were of early institution, and of frequent recurrence; but it was not till then that the diocesan clergy were recognised as a part of the national synod assembled in a representative capacity. At a council holden at Reading, in the seventh year of his reign, it was enacted, that at least two representatives, chosen by the clergy of every Bishopric, should attend. The purpose for which their attendance was required was declared to be, not only to redress grievances, or to grant subsidies, but to deliberate concerning the general welfare of the Church<sup>x</sup>. No measure was so admirably calculated to form a barrier against the usurpations of a foreign spiritual power as a national and a representative convocation.

This was far from being the only or the most important measure of Edward the First for reducing the papal supremacy: he attempted to repress that pernicious custom of enriching foreigners with the ecclesiastical property of England. This custom, introduced and sanctioned by the see of Rome, was afterwards called *provision*, as the persons

<sup>x</sup> "Item præcipimus ut veniant duo electi ad minus a clero episcopatum singulorum, qui auctoritatem habeant unâ nobiscum, tractare de his quæ ecclesia communi utilitati expedient Anglicanæ, etiamsi de conturbatione aliquâ vel expensis oporteat fieri mentionem."—Lynwode.

who committed the abuse were called *provisors*. Though these names were not imposed till a future reign, yet the abuse existed in this, and a statute was enacted for its remedy<sup>y</sup>. It was therein represented that governors of religious houses, and certain aliens their superiors, were accustomed to lay impositions upon monasteries and houses in subjection to them, so that much of the opulence originally intended for religious service, for the support of the poor, sick, and feeble, and for the maintenance of hospitality, was conveyed out of the kingdom. To prevent this evil, it was enacted, that no religious person whatsoever should, under any pretext, send this tax out of the kingdom, under pain of being grievously punished for a contempt of the King's injunctions.

The reign of Edward the Second, from the weakness of the executive power, is inconsiderable in the ecclesiastical history of England. The Clergy, who had been reduced to some degree of subordination in the preceding reign, began to revive their former claims of exemption from secular control: but the lengthened reign of Edward the Third fills a distinguished space in the national annals.

It is in this reign that the Parliament is supposed to have assumed its present form, by a separation of the Commons from the Lords<sup>z</sup>. It is in this reign also that the outline of an English Convocation, obscurely to be traced in the reign of the first Edward, was filled up. As the two Houses of Parliament originally sat together, so did the two Houses of Convocation; but when the Commons were withdrawn from the Peers, the inferior Clergy were separated from the Prelates. The Bishops having a double capacity, as spiritual governors and temporal barons, sat both in the upper House of Parliament and the upper House of Convocation; but in other respects these two legislative bodies were not only distinct, but preserved

<sup>y</sup> Entitled, *de Apportis Religiosorum*, 35 Ed. I. st. 1. c. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>z</sup> See Hallam's *Middle Ages*, vol. iii. p. 56.

an analogy in their constitution. In the upper House of Convocation were placed the Bishops, and not only the mitred abbots, who, in right of their baronies, had a seat in the temporal Parliament, but the heads of the other monastic communities. The lower House consisted of the Deans, Archdeacons, and the Proctors of the Clergy, whether capitular, or parochial, or collegiate. The lower House of Convocation, like the temporal Commons, chose its prolocutor, who moderated their debates, and was their organ in delivering their sentiments, or asserting their privileges<sup>a</sup>. Bills of subsidy and grievances began usually in the lower House; and, in matters of jurisdiction, the upper House gave sentence, while the lower House prosecuted. The time of their meeting was most commonly concurrent with that of the Parliament; the Proctors of Convocation were elected in the same manner as the Knights of the shires; and the lower House of Convocation was styled, both in the rolls of Parliament and in the registers of Convocation, the Commons spiritual of the realm<sup>b</sup>.

The resistance against papal encroachment was now become more formidable, because it was carried on by all the estates of the realm, with the King at their head. Since the time of Edward the First, the abuse of *provisions* had so much increased, that, during the minority of Edward the Third, a petition was signed by the Commons,

<sup>a</sup> This was the custom of the province of Canterbury: the province of York had also its synod; but it consisted only of one house. A correspondence was maintained between the synods of the two provinces; and the same subjects which had been deliberated in the synod of Canterbury were afterwards debated by the synod of York. To prevent a disagreement between the two synods proctors were sometimes deputed from the province of York to the Convocation of the province of Canterbury, and thus the whole English Church was represented in one assembly.

<sup>b</sup> Atterbury's Rights, Powers, &c. of an English Convocation. c. i. and ii.

praying that no alien provisor, nor any procurator for him, should enter or depart from the realm, in order to prosecute any ‘provision,’ under pain of life and member; but the further consideration of the matter was reserved until the King should be of age<sup>c</sup>. No further legislative proceeding appears to have been adopted till many years afterwards, when the Parliament enacted two statutes against ‘provisors<sup>d</sup>.’

The first of these statutes fully defined the nature and grounds of the offence, and the necessity of its prevention. It opened with a recitation that the Church of England was founded by the King and nobles of the realm, for their instruction and that of the people, and for the purposes of hospitality and charity. It proceeded to state, that for these purposes large revenues had been appropriated to Prelates and other beneficiaries, from which resulted the right of collation and presentation claimed by the King and his nobles; and that the higher orders of the Clergy constituted a considerable part of the King’s great council, to advise him in national affairs. This being the nature and condition of the English Church, it was considered a great grievance that the Bishop of Rome, *accroaching* to himself the seigniories of such possessions and benefices, granted them to aliens who never dwelt in England, to cardinals who, by the rule of their order, never could dwell there, and to others, as well aliens and denizens, as if he were the patron, and had the advowson of such dignities and benefices, contrary to the known law of the kingdom. It went on to declare that, if the practice were not abolished, there would be scarcely a benefice in the kingdom that would not be in the hands of foreigners, to the entire perversion of the ends for which ecclesiastical establishments were founded.

An observance of this statute was enforced by severe

<sup>c</sup> Parl. Rot. 1 Ed. III. 26.

<sup>d</sup> Stat. 25 Ed. III. 6, and 27 Ed. III. 1.

penalties, and the prosecution of appeals at Rome gave rise to a second law against *provisors*. It was enacted, that if 1352 any persons, owing allegiance to the King, should draw any plea out of the realm, the cognizance of which belonged to the King's court, they should, after due admonition and disobedience to such warning, be put out of the King's protection, and be subjected to forfeiture of goods and imprisonment.

In vain did the see of Rome express its resentment at these measures. When Urban the Fifth attempted to revive the vassalage and annual rent to which King John had submitted, it was unanimously agreed, by all the estates of the realm in Parliament assembled, that King John's donation was null and void, being without the concurrence of Parliament, and contrary to his coronation oath. The temporal nobility and the Commons engaged, that, if the Pope should endeavour, by process or otherwise, to maintain these usurpations, they would withstand him to the utmost of their power.

The Popedom sustained, in this reign, a still more dangerous attack from an individual than it received even from an English King and Parliament. This individual was Wiclif. Grosthead, Bishop of Lincoln<sup>e</sup>, in the preceding century, had powerfully inveighed against the tyranny of the Pope, both civil and spiritual: Wiclif followed in the same track, and with greater success.

Of the English Reformation Wiclif was not only the precursor but the prototype<sup>f</sup>. He opposed the Romish Church in the manner in which the separation of England from its communion was afterwards effected: he first

<sup>e</sup> This Prelate was excommunicated by Pope Innocent IV.; but it is said of him, “excommunicatus appellavit a curia Innocentii ad tribunal Christi.”—Henr. de Knyghton. inter Scriptores X. lib. ii. p. 2436.

<sup>f</sup> An Apology for John Wiclif, showing his Conformity with the Church of England, was published by Thomas James, Keeper of the Bodleian Library. Oxford, 1708.

renounced its jurisdiction, and then confuted its doctrinal corruptions. Standing in this conspicuous view, it is necessary to give a more particular relation of his character and actions.

Educated at Queen's and Merton Colleges, in the University of Oxford, Wiclif pursued with assiduity all the studies usually cultivated in that famous seat of learning. Having penetrated the depths of the Aristotelian philosophy, and the subtleties of metaphysical theology, he acquired an accurate knowledge of law, civil, canon, and municipal<sup>g</sup>. While, however, in these branches of knowledge he was equalled by many of his contemporaries, in one of the greatest importance he excelled them all, or rather stood in solitary preeminence. The title of Evangelical Doctor, by which he was commonly distinguished, at once proves his proficiency in scriptural learning, and also the rarity of its attainment.

Being promoted to the Mastership of Balliol Hall, he soon attracted the attention and secured the gratitude of the University by defending its privileges against <sup>1360</sup> the encroachments of the mendicant friars. These had so increased in numbers and importance, that they claimed an exemption from academical discipline: they enticed the youth from the Colleges into the convents, and incited them to disaffection and rebellion. From Balliol, Wiclif was removed to the Wardenship of Canterbury Hall, by the special appointment of the founder, Simon de Islip; but the death of his patron prevented him from a quiet enjoyment of the promotion. Langham, the successor of Islip in the see of Canterbury, and as such the Visitor of Canterbury Hall, ejected Wiclif from the Wardenship. Wiclif, and three other Fellows expelled with him, appealed to the Pope against a proceeding at once illegal and unjust: but, after a tedious delay of three or four years, a definitive

<sup>g</sup> Lewis's Life of Wiclif, c. i. p. 13.

sentence of Pope Urban the Fifth confirmed what Langham had done.

That this ungenerous treatment first incited Wiclif to a systematic hostility against the papal Hierarchy, is the unfounded insinuation of his enemies; because it is certain, that for many years before his deprivation, he had opposed the court of Rome in its practice of granting *provisors* to ecclesiastical benefices. That his deprivation, and its confirmation by the Pope, irritated a temper naturally warm, there is no occasion to deny.

The deprivation of Wiclif, and his public disputation with a monk in defence of the regal prerogative, introduced him to the notice of the court, and particularly of the Duke of Lancaster, the King's brother. He now was advanced to the doctorate, and in his public lectures at Oxford exposed the corruptions of the friars, imputing to them all the errors and calamities of the Christian Church<sup>h</sup>. So high was his reputation, that he was joined in an embassy to treat with the Pope's nuncios, at Bruges, "concerning the liberties of the Church of England."

It is not improbable that Wiclif, by being concerned in this treaty, became more intimately acquainted than before with the corruptions of the Romish see. On his return he inveighed against the whole papal Hierarchy with the greatest boldness. He exposed both the covetousness and ambition of the Pope, and also his encroachments on the regal prerogative; and he reproved freely the vices of the clergy, both secular and monastic. It was an observation of his, "that the abomination of desolation has its beginning from a perverse clergy, as comfort arises from a converted clergy<sup>i</sup>."

While he was employed by the King in his embassy to Bruges, he was collated to a Prebend in the collegiate Church of Westbury, and to the Rectory of Lutterworth.

<sup>h</sup> See Le Bas's Life of Wiclif, p. 189.

<sup>i</sup> Dialog. Jo. Wiclefi MDXXV, p. cxxv.

Having retired from the University, he resided on his benefice, where he performed the office of a diligent and edifying pastor, preaching constantly not only on Sundays, but on all the festivals of the Church. But as soon as he had begun in his public lectures to oppose the papal usurpations, and to defend the royal supremacy, a prosecution was instituted against him at Rome. The articles of accusation were sixteen, of which the first five related to the temporal dominion claimed by the Pope; and the others to what is called the power of the keys.

1376

As soon as the Pope had received these articles, he despatched several bulls of the same date to Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, William Courtney, Bishop of London, whom he delegated to examine into the complaint; and also to the King himself, and to the University of Oxford. Before these instruments could reach England, Edward the Third was dead; the University of Oxford, after debating if the papal communication should not be rejected with disgrace, received it in silence; but the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London proceeded to execute the mandate of the Apostolic see.

Notwithstanding the precarious authority which Richard the Second held among his contending nobles, he began his reign with maintaining the laws enacted by his predecessor against the usurpations of the Pope. In his first Parliament it was debated, whether the kingdom of England, on an imminent necessity, might not detain the annual tribute paid to the Pope under the name of Peter-pence. The resolution of this doubt was referred by the King and Parliament to Wiclif, who decided that the tribute might be detained lawfully, and that it was not a debt, but a charitable donation. The same Parliament also petitioned the King, that the statutes against *provisors* should be enforced; that the treaty of King Edward the Third, concerning the Pope's reservation to ecclesiastical

dignities, should be maintained; and that all aliens, as well religious as others, should be sent out of the realm.

This conduct of the Parliament was viewed by the Bishops with jealousy and apprehension. That they might express their dissent with more safety to themselves, and in a manner less offensive to the temporality, they caused a protestation to be enrolled on behalf of themselves and the Clergy, wherein they declared, that they intended not to assent to any statute made in derogation of the Pope's authority, but would utterly withstand the same.

Fortified by such powerful allies as the King and Parliament, protected also by the University of Oxford, Wiclif had no reluctance to appear before the Pope's delegates. Attended by the Duke of Lancaster, and Lord Henry Piercy, the Earl-Marshal, he repaired to the Cathedral Church of Saint Paul, where the delegates sat. The first session was only remarkable for the firm yet intemperate conduct of Lancaster towards the Bishop of London. At the second session, Wiclif is said to have delivered a written answer to the articles alleged against him. But though his explanation was not satisfactory to the delegates, they were contented with dismissing him, after enjoining him not to repeat such propositions either in the schools or in his sermons. Besides his answers to the delegates, he presented a defence of his opinions to the Parliament which met at the beginning of this year.

In consequence of the death of Gregory the Eleventh, and the disagreement of the Cardinals on the choice of a successor, Wiclif was permitted to retire to Lutterworth. There he continued to expose the Romish court and the vices of the Clergy, and there he proceeded with an undertaking to which he had long devoted himself, a translation of the Holy Scriptures into English. This, it seems, had not been done before; or, if some parts of the sacred writings had been rendered into English for private use, they had never been published in that language. The

clamours raised against him on this occasion were great, and they were increased when he commenced his attack on the doctrinal errors of the Romish Church.

Though Wiclif resided chiefly at Lutterworth, yet he did not relinquish his connexion with Oxford. In a course of Theological Lectures which he delivered there, he confuted the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, and maintained the true and ancient notion of the Lord's Supper. For this end, he proposed twelve conclusions on the subject; of which the first was, “that the consecrated host, which we see upon the altar, is neither Christ, nor any part of Him, but an effectual sign of Him.” Not being suffered to defend his conclusions in the Schools, he published his opinions on the nature of the Eucharist in a treatise<sup>k</sup>.

The opposition of Wiclif to the doctrine of transubstantiation deprived him of the protection of the University of Oxford. The Chancellor, on the publication of these conclusions, condemned them in a formal decree. Wiclif, having unsuccessfully appealed against the Chancellor to the Parliament, was cited before Courtney, Archbishop of Canterbury, and several other Bishops, first at London, and then at Oxford. Besides the opinions which he avowedly maintained, others were charged on him, which he disclaimed. While, therefore, in his confession he was anxious to exculpate himself from errors which he did not hold, he openly maintained his opinion of the Sacrament, declared his resolution to defend it with his blood, and censured the contrary doctrine as heresy.

The conclusions which were assigned to Wiclif by his enemies, as well as those which he really maintained, were indiscriminately condemned. His followers and favourers were pronounced to be excommunicated; and, by virtue of the King's letters to the Chancellor, he was ultimately expelled from the University of Oxford.

<sup>k</sup> [“That some sort of change was effected, he (Wiclif) assuredly did believe.” Le Bas's Wiclif, p. 344.]

Thus driven from the University, he retired to his benefice, and to the end of his life laboured in the cause for which he had suffered. Had Providence prolonged his days, he would have been exposed to new dangers; but 1384 death terminated his exertions and his trials. His fervent piety and his unblemished morals, the most inveterate of his enemies have not dared to question; while the vigour of his mind, and the extent of his learning, have been sufficiently and even liberally acknowledged<sup>1</sup>.

To connect the history of the English Church with the biography of Wiclid, is not to invest that celebrated individual with an importance beyond his merits. His influence on the public transactions of that period was greater than is commonly supposed, and the progress of religious knowledge may be estimated from the support, as well as from the opposition, which he experienced. As long as he defended the regal prerogative against the usurped jurisdiction of the Pope, so long he had the countenance of the Duke of Lancaster, and so long was he supported by the King and Parliament. But when he ventured to dispute against the common notion of the real presence, he was deserted by his powerful friends, and his appeal to the Parliament in 1382, for protection against ecclesiastical censure, was rejected.

At this period may be discerned a distinction established by the legislature between the temporal authority of the Pope, and the doctrines of the Romish Church: the first was opposed, the second was defended by legal penalties. At the time when Wiclid was condemned for his doctrinal opinions, the laws against the papal jurisdiction were strengthened and renewed. By the act commonly called the statute of *præmunire*<sup>m</sup>, the penalties of imprisonment and forfeiture of goods were inflicted on all who procured

<sup>1</sup> [Archbishop Arundel said, 'Wiclid was a great clerk, and many held him a perfect liver.' Lewis's Life of Wiclid, c. vii. note, p. 126.]

<sup>m</sup> 16 Rich. II. c. 5.

at Rome processes, bulls, or any other instruments, in prejudice of the rights of the Crown. This famous statute was introduced with a preamble, stating that all the Lords, both spiritual and temporal, had been singly asked, whether they would support the King in maintaining his authority against the bulls of the Pope. The temporal Lords declared such an interference to be a violation of the ancient law, and promised that they would stand by the King to live or die. The Prelates went not so far; they avowed their determination to resist the papal sentences of excommunication against any one for executing the processes of the King's courts, but with a reservation of their opinion as to the general rights of the apostolic see.

It is impossible to pass over the reign of Henry the Fourth, without noticing its distinguishing feature, that at this period were enacted the last statute against *provisors*<sup>n</sup>, and the first against *heresy*<sup>o</sup>. The Wyclifites, or, as they were commonly styled, the Lollards<sup>p</sup>, by their lives and doctrines, as well as by their numbers, had become a terror and a reproach to the higher orders of the Clergy. They had their separate places of religious worship, and their increase is attested by Knyghton, a popish historian, who says, that if two persons were met travelling on the road, it was most probable that one of them was a Wyclifite.

At the accession of Henry the Fourth, there was no temporal law against heresy; for a statute surreptitiously obtained in the preceding reign had been repealed. But the first King of the Lancastrian line had been so materially assisted by his Clergy in gaining the crown, that he consented, at their instigation, to adopt the most rigorous

<sup>n</sup> 2 Hen. IV. c. 3.

<sup>o</sup> 2 Hen. IV. c. 15.

<sup>p</sup> The derivation of this name is doubtful. Some derive it from Walter Lollard, a German; but our canonist Lynewode from the Latin word *lolium*, cockle; because as that weed injures the wheat, the Lollards corrupted the faithful in the Church. Lewis's Life of Pecock, c. i. p. 7.

measures against the Lollards. Their assemblies, in the language of the statute, were stigmatized as confederacies of sedition and insurrection. To prevent them from teaching heretical doctrines, all persons who had any books or writings of the Lollards were commanded to deliver them to their diocesan, and those who refused or neglected to do so were to be arrested and committed to prison. The ordinary was allowed to proceed against such offenders; and in case of their refusal to abjure their errors, they were to be burnt, to the example and terror of others.

From the early part of the reign of Richard the Second, to the end of the succeeding reign, there was a schism in the Popedom. The papal dominions and the papal attributes were disputed by rival claimants, who were obliged to seek protection from the temporal powers of Christendom. The kingdoms of Europe were divided; some espousing the cause of the Popes at Rome, and others acknowledging the Popes at Avignon. England, in opposition to France, adhered to the Popes of Rome.

1413.] The military reign of Henry the Fifth was remarkable for the rigour with which the Lollards were pursued by the secular power, in subserviency to the ecclesiastical. This period, disgraced by the prosecution of Lord Cobham, presents in its judicial history a melancholy record of ecclesiastical tyranny. A statute, passed soon after the accession of this prince<sup>q</sup>, enacted, that the magistrates should use their whole power and diligence to destroy all heresies and errors, only they were enjoined not to postpone the King's service to that of the Church. In the preamble of the statute, the Lollards were loaded with the imputation of state crimes; they were described as united in a confederacy to destroy the King and all the other estates of the realm, both lay and spiritual, “all manner of policy, and finally the laws of the land.”

<sup>q</sup> 2 Hen. V. st. 1. c. 7.

When the schism in the popedom was at an end\*, the wars between the houses of York and Lancaster began; and the Pontiffs embraced this occasion of reassuming all their former claims over England. In the reign of the feeble-minded Henry the Sixth, Pope Martin the Fifth, asserted all the prerogatives of his predecessors in the chair of St. Peter. He wrote to Chichelé, then raised to the see of Canterbury, remonstrating with the Archbishop for his remissness in maintaining the rights of the Apostolic See, and condemning in the strongest language the statute of *præmunire*. Chichelé was exhorted to imitate the example of Saint Thomas of Canterbury, the holy martyr, in asserting the rights of the Church; and was farther required to declare at the next Parliament the unlawfulness of that statute, and to denounce excommunication against all who obeyed it. The Clergy of England also were commanded to preach against a law so offensive to the see of Rome.

Chichelé, being tardy in his compliance with this admonition, and having unwarily said, "that the Pope's zeal in this matter was that he might raise much money out of England," was punished by suspension from his legatine functions. The Pope then, in an Epistle addressed to both Archbishops, pronounced the statutes of Edward the Third, and Richard the Second, void: all who presumed to put them in force, or to obey them, were subjected to the greater excommunication, not to be remitted but by the Pope himself. Not satisfied with this letter, to the two Archbishops, he directed his remonstrances to the King and Parliament. In his letter to the Parliament, he said that no man who obeyed these statutes could possibly obtain salvation, and demanded their repeal under pain of damnation.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his own justification,

\* [Benedict XIII, a deposed Pope, refused to submit to the General Council, and died in 1424.]

appealed against the injustice of his suspension to the next General Council, or to the tribunal of God and Jesus Christ. He wrote to the Pope in the most submissive terms, protesting that he had done, and would do, all in his power to procure the repeal of those obnoxious laws. He had heard of the sentence of suspension pronounced against him, a proceeding unknown from the days of Augustin to that time. But he added, that the sentence was known to him only by report, since the bulls containing it had, by the King's command, remained sealed and unopened until the Parliament should assemble.

The Parliament, which met at the beginning of the next year, afforded the Primate an opportunity of testifying his obedience to the Pope, without any dereliction of his duty to his King and country. Attended by the Archbishop of York, and several other Prelates, he went from the House of Lords to the refectory of the Abbey of Westminster, where the Commons usually sat. There he made a long oration, in the form of a sermon, on the text, "Render unto Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's, and unto God the things that be God's." He began with a protestation, that neither himself nor his brethren intended to maintain any doctrine derogatory from the King. He alleged many arguments to prove the divine right of the Pope to grant *provisions*, and exhorted the Commons to give to the holy father the desired satisfaction. With tears in his eyes he depicted the calamities which the country must suffer by an interdict, a calamity which would certainly happen, if the satisfaction were not granted.

The oratory of the Archbishop appears to have been exerted in vain on the House of Commons; for they would pass no act either of repeal or explanation. It was effectual only in mitigating the resentment of the Pope against himself; for he was soon afterwards restored to the exercise of his legatine functions.

Thus stood the laws relative to the papal jurisdiction

and the punishment of heresy, until the time of Henry the Eighth. The statutes of *provisors* and of *præmunire* were unrepealed; but their execution was suspended, and, like other obsolete penal statutes, they were a snare to the unwary. After having long slumbered, their resuscitation was intended not to redress those evils for which they were originally framed, but to punish an incautious violation of their enactments. But the statutes against heresy were vigorously and almost unremittingly enforced; as the Wyclifites increased in numbers, the ecclesiastical and civil government increased in severity.

The tyrannical reign of Richard the Third gave occasion to Henry, Earl of Richmond, to assert his title to the crown; a title the most remote and unaccountable that was ever pretended, and which nothing but the general detestation of Richard could have rendered plausible. The manifest defectiveness of this title,<sup>1485</sup> as well as a superstitious bias, inclined him to preserve the friendship of the Romish See. The liberality of his policy has been too highly praised; for his chief aim was to extort money from his subjects, and to amass treasure in the royal coffers<sup>r</sup>. His ecclesiastical policy will not admit of vindication: while he permitted his nobles to alienate their lands, he increased the wealth and privileges of the monasteries; aggravating thereby the evils of the monastic system, by disarranging the balance between the temporal and spiritual seigniories. The statutes of *provisors* and *præmunire* were violated by the King himself; for, in defiance of these laws, he promoted foreigners to the most lucrative Bishoprics.

The time was, however, fast approaching when a new order of things was to take place, which Henry did not foresee, and which, had he foreseen, he could not have

<sup>r</sup> Blackstone's Com. v. iv. c. 23. p. 309. "Of Nature assuredly he coveted to accumulate treasure, and was a little poor in admiring riches." Hist. of Hen. VII. by Lord Bacon.

prevented. The invention of the art of printing had given a new direction to the human mind, and disposed it to seek after and embrace religious truth: learning, which has often been perverted to corrupt Christianity, was now employed to restore and purify it. All circumstances concurred to promote that great revolution in the civil and religious world, which the adherents of the Romish Church alone stigmatize as the grand schism; but which, under the blessing of Divine Providence, and through the predominance of protestant principle, is known to us under no other name than **THE REFORMATION.**

---

## HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

### CHAPTER II.

State of Europe at the beginning of the 16th Century.—Of England and the Church.—Character of Warham.—Of Wolsey, and his attempt to gain the Popedom.—Election of Clement VII.—His quarrel with the Emperor Charles V. and Imprisonment.—His escape to Orvieto.—Suit of Henry VIII. in the Consistory of Rome for a Divorce from Catherine of Arragon.—State of that Question.—A Commission of Legation to try the Cause in England.—Progress of the Trial, and Avocation of the Cause to Rome.

THE beginning of the sixteenth century is an era celebrated in the Christian Church for the revival of learning, and the reformation of religion. It is an era on which the cultivated mind loves to dwell, deriving from its contemplation a pleasure not abated by any difference of religious opinion, but, on the contrary, rendered more lively and intense.

The votary of the Church of Rome looks back with fondness and regret on the period when, if her authority was not the most despotic, her subjects were the most enlightened; when Leo gave fresh zeal to that ardour for knowledge which had for some ages been spreading over

Europe ; and when the classical pen of Bembo and Sadoleto announced to the European states the epistles and rescripts of the apostolical chamber. With exultation he enumerates the distinguished characters which adorned the court of the Medicean pontiff, and concludes that the popedom was not an empire built on the foundation of ignorance, since it materially contributed to the restoration of the fine arts, of abstruse science, and of polite literature.

On the other hand, the Protestant hails this period with an enthusiasm more chastened, but scarcely less ardent. In the boasted splendour of the Romish Court, he sees the downfall of the Romish Church. It was a splendour which, instead of dazzling the eyes of dispassionate inquirers, illustrated all the errors of the papal system. The prodigal magnificence of Leo was more ruinous to its interests, than the repulsive vices of his predecessors,—than the ambition of Julius, or the cruelty of Alexander.

While the Romanist and the Reformer unite in praising the “golden days” of Leo, their attention is attracted to those other personages who, in a more narrow sphere, influenced the progress of religious opinion. The sovereignty of the European continent was at this time disputed and divided by the powers of France and Spain. Their monarchs had contested the imperial crown, and the success of Charles over the pretensions of Francis had placed an insurmountable barrier between himself and his disappointed rival. Neither of these princes was an unconcerned spectator of the changes in religion ; but at this period their chief object was chivalrous renown and military conquest. They were now at the beginning of their career ; Francis pursuing it with the vigorous steadiness of manhood, Charles with the unrestrained impetuosity of youth.

And this period comprises the early part of the reign of Henry the Eighth, the only part on which it is possible for the mind to rest with complacency. He now sustained his place in that triumvirate of sovereigns which guided the

affairs of the civilized world, alternately the friend and the enemy of Francis and of Charles, but a competitor in the lists of fame with both. As yet his vices were those of prosperity and youth. He had not yet made the common transition from careless voluptuousness to callous ferocity; he had not yet reached that point of uncontrolled indulgence, when “he spared neither man in his hate, nor woman in his lust.” The professor of any Christian sect can view him with indulgence, when, in the pride of scholastic theology, he presented his treatise on the Sacraments to the accomplished Leo, and, as the meed of his labours, bore away the envied title of “Defender of the Faith.” But humanity as well as religion recoils at the enormities of his latter days, when he incurred the disgrace of apostasy without the merit of conversion; when he was alike disclaimed by Protestant and Papist, for both were the objects of his unrelenting persecution.

At no period was the submission of England to the see of Rome more unlimited, than at the beginning of 1509 Henry's reign. In his treatise on the Sacraments, to 1524 he had advanced the papal power far beyond the enactments of law and the prescription of the regal prerogative\*; and when such a tone was given to the religious sentiments of his people by the Sovereign himself, it might be expected that the English Prelacy would not be slow in following the example.

The see of Canterbury was at this time filled by Warham, whose devotedness to the Church in which he was educated was not less strict than conscientious. He had been elevated to his high station by Henry the Seventh, and under that Prince united with the archiepiscopal dignity the office of Lord Chancellor. In the learning then chiefly in repute he was learned, for he was eminently skilled in the Canon law. Though tinctured with the severity of

\* Life of Sir Thomas More, in Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 169. and Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 31.

the age against innovation in matters of religion, yet when Colet, the Dean of Saint Paul's, was judicially accused before him for preaching against existing superstitions and the vices of the Clergy, he interposed his authority, and dismissed the accusation. But as the friend and protector of Erasmus, Warham will be most honourably remembered by posterity. Jortin, who was the biographer of that ornament of literature, could not receive from his patron, Archbishop Herring, a more gratifying and decisive testimony than the assurance, "I will be to you what Warham was to Erasmus."

Second to Warham in the English Church, but first in ecclesiastical dignity, and infinitely higher in political importance, stood Wolsey. To attempt a delineation of his character would insensibly lead to the adoption of the sentiment and phraseology of our great dramatic poet, whose genius was never more happily employed than in refining the rugged but sterling ore of the British chronicles. Of thought and diction so universally admired, it is useless to be a faithful copyist, it is irksome to be a tolerable imitator, it is impossible to be an undetected plagiary.

Leaving this masterly portraiture of Wolsey untouched, it is sufficient to describe his actual situation as a statesman and an ecclesiastic. He had been promoted by Henry the Seventh to the Deanery of Lincoln, and his preferment as one of the King's Chaplains introduced him to the early notice of Henry the Eighth. In the war which took place between England and France, for the preservation of the balance of power, he displayed such ability and address, while he attended the young King, that he soon received the highest marks of royal favour. He was appointed <sup>1513</sup> by Henry, Bishop of Tournay in France, while that city was in possession of the English forces; on the King's return, he was appointed Bishop of Lincoln, and soon afterwards promoted to the archiepiscopal see of York.

This was the height of his ecclesiastical preferment in

England; but his influence with the Court of Rome, joined with the reputation acquired by Henry there as "Defender of the Faith," procured for him an admission into the sacred college. Raised to the rank of a Cardinal, he was constituted the Pope's special Legate over the realm of England, and by virtue of this commission he asserted an authority over the province of Canterbury, and often cited its Clergy to assemble in a Synod. After a few ineffectual struggles, Warham was compelled to submit to his more powerful rival, and also to resign to him the office of Lord Chancellor.

Wolsey was now the chief minister of England; but from the time of his admission into the Conclave, his ambitious views were ultimately fixed on Rome. His aim was the Chair of Saint Peter, and to the attainment of his wishes he rendered subservient both the alliances and the enmities of his own country. At home, even the Papacy could confer on him no accession of power; he was indeed "*papa alterius orbis*." In defiance of the statutes of *provisors* and *præmunire*, he granted institution to benefices throughout the kingdom, without the consent of the Bishop of the diocese, and solely by virtue of his legatine commission. But in his own person he concentrated no inconsiderable portion of the episcopal jurisdiction, and of the episcopal revenues of the kingdom. Besides the see of York, he had commendatory possession of the wealthy Bishopric of Durham, which he afterwards exchanged for that of Winchester. The Bishoprics of Bath, Worcester, and Hereford were held by foreigners, contrary to the laws; and these sees he had in farm, paying to their nominal possessors an annual pension, and reserving to himself the disposal of all the benefices within their dioceses.

Invested with these high powers during the splendid pontificate of Leo, and the short pontificate of Adrian,  
1523 Wolsey, on the death of the latter, entertained a

sanguine, and not an unreasonable, expectation, of grasping the object which he had so long and eagerly pursued. The Emperor had promised to favour his pretensions; and it is not to be doubted that Henry laboured with cordiality in promoting the advancement of his favourite minister. Wolsey himself, whatever might be his secret inclinations, took care to disguise them. While the election was in suspense, though he secretly instructed his agents to spare neither bribes nor promises, yet he outwardly displayed no symptoms of anxiety. He not only declared his unfitness for the high office, but his disinclination to leave the service of his royal master<sup>t</sup>; and when the election was decided against him, he sent his congratulations to Henry on the election of the Cardinal de Medicis, as an event for which the King and kingdom of England had cause to thank Almighty God<sup>u</sup>.

These warm professions on the part of Wolsey were returned by the new Pope with substantial marks of kindness and esteem. The legatine powers of the Cardinal of York over England were enlarged, and confirmed to him during the term of his life, and he was actually invested with papal jurisdiction over his native country.

Clement the Seventh was indebted, for his advancement to the popedom, partly to the interest of the Medicean family, and the aversion of the people of Rome to another ultra-montane Pontiff, after their experience of Adrian; and partly to the support of the Emperor Charles the Fifth. High expectations were formed of one whose great talents and experience in business seemed to qualify him for defending the spiritual interests of the Church, en-

<sup>t</sup> "I repute myself right unmeet and unable to so high a dignity, desiring much rather to demure, continue and end my life with your Grace,.....than to be ten popes." Letter of Wolsey to Henry VIII. Sept. 30, 1523. Burnet's History of the Reformation, Collection of Records, vol. iii. b. i. no. 7.

<sup>u</sup> Fiddes's Life of Wolsey, p. 295.

dangered by the progress of Lutheran doctrines, and also for conducting its political operations at a very critical juncture\*.

The ecclesiastical state, though defended by the formidable artillery of spiritual censures, was never of the highest rank among the European powers. In any war, it could never be a principal, but might be a highly useful auxiliary. It was under the necessity of concealing or sustaining its real weakness, by throwing its weight into the scale of one out of two contending parties; and its policy was to support the weaker.

Clement, who had hitherto been attached to the Emperor, both by interest and gratitude, no sooner witnessed the decisive battle of Pavia, (1525.) and the consequent treaty of Madrid, than he became jealous of the imperial power. Joining himself with the Venetians, the Duke of Milan, and the King of England, he openly went over to the cause of Francis. A league was formed against the Emperor by these different states, which was dignified by the title of Holy, because the Pope was at its head, and of which the King of England was declared the protector. (1526.)

The imprudence of Clement in entering into such a treaty, corresponded with the general timidity and insincerity of his character. Charles, incensed at his duplicity and ingratitude, resolved to inflict on him a signal punishment. Through the family of Colonna, the most powerful of all the Roman barons, the Emperor was enabled to carry the war to the gates of Rome. The Colonnes became masters of the city, and did not leave it until they had gained from Clement a promise to withdraw his troops from the confederation.

But no sooner had the papal forces returned from Lombardy, than Clement excommunicated the whole family of Colonna, seized their possessions, and wasted their

\* Guicciard. Hist. It. 1. 15.

lands, with all the cruelty which the sense of a recent injury naturally excites. He then turned his thoughts towards Naples, and, seconded by the French fleet, made some progress towards the conquest of that kingdom.

Charles was now provoked beyond endurance. The imperial forces, under the command of Bourbon, marched to the gates of Rome, which opposed but a feeble resistance. Clement, after some ineffectual military preparations, and after fulminating an excommunication at his enemies, was obliged to capitulate on such terms as the victorious imperialists thought fit to impose, and was imprisoned, by the Emperor's command, in the castle of Saint Angelo.

The different powers of Europe, and especially those which constituted the Holy League, saw with indignation and dismay the outrage committed against the Church in the person of its supreme head. Nor was the Pope deficient in using every art to excite their compassion, and engage their aid. In concise but moving terms he wrote to Cardinal Wolsey, excusing himself from entering into a detail of his misfortunes, as they could be more clearly explained by Sir Gregory Cassali, the English ambassador at Rome. His sole confidence and consolation was now reposed on the friendship of the Cardinal, and on the devoted attachment of the King of England to the holy see.

Wolsey, animated as well by sympathy towards the Pope, as by personal resentment against the Emperor, was not inattentive to the application. A negociation was immediately opened with Francis, and conducted by Wolsey in person, of which the liberation of the Pope was a leading article. A new league was formed; and though the King of England supplied no troops, he liberally contributed pecuniary aid. An army was raised, of which the French General Lautrec was appointed commander; and the Florentine and Venetian forces having

united with the French, Lautrec advanced as far as Milan, in his progress towards the capital of Italy.

In the mean time, Charles, alarmed at the approach of the confederates, thought it fit to treat with the Pope concerning his liberation. The conditions prescribed by the Emperor were hard, but not more rigorous than the captive Pontiff had reason to expect. One hundred thousand crowns were actually paid by Clement before the day was fixed for his release; a sum which he raised by the sale of ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, and by other methods equally uncanonical. A second sum of one hundred thousand crowns was to be paid at the distance of a fortnight; and, at the expiration of three months, a third payment of one hundred and fifty thousand crowns was required. He also engaged not to take part in the war against the Emperor, either in Lombardy or Naples; and he not only gave hostages, but ceded the possession of several towns, as a security for the performance of the stipulated articles. A day was then fixed for his release from imprisonment; but impatience of confinement, and suspicion of the faith of Charles, induced him to take advantage of the remitted vigilance with which he was guarded after the commencement of the treaty. In the disguise of a merchant, and accompanied only by a single attendant, he succeeded in escaping from the castle of Saint Angelo during the night, and before the next morning arrived at Orvieto, a small town in the ecclesiastical state, distant about fifteen leagues from Rome.

Orvieto is memorable in Ecclesiastical History, as being the place where the divorce of Henry the Eighth of England from Catherine of Arragon was first brought under the cognizance of the papal court. The wishes and sentiments of Henry on this important subject had been privately communicated to Clement while a prisoner in

the castle of Saint Angelo; but it was at Orvieto that a formal motion was first made to bring the cause before the consistory of Rome. It is at this point of the narrative, therefore, that a statement of the question naturally demands insertion. It is not more than just, even to Henry, that his motives and his professions should be set forth as they were urged by himself. It is highly injurious to the advocates of his cause, that the arguments by which it was defended should not be faithfully recorded. The justice of his cause will not be invalidated even by the concession that his motives in prosecuting it were bad. That is not indeed altogether the fact: he was actuated by different motives, though the preponderating motive was satiety of Catherine and a passion for Anne Boleyn.

Catherine of Arragon, once the Infanta of Spain, was a Princess not destitute of personal charms, and possessed of great wealth, and of high connexions. On these last accounts, an union of this Princess with the royal family of England was ardently desired by Henry the Seventh. She had for her dowry two hundred thousand ducats, the largest which had been given for many years with any Princess, and her alliance with Spain and Burgundy constituted a foundation for a confederacy between those kingdoms and England against the growing power of France. A marriage recommended by such politic considerations was successfully promoted by the English monarch, and the Infanta was publicly married to his elder son, Arthur, then Prince of Wales, a youth <sup>1501</sup> in his sixteenth year. The Spanish ambassador was satisfied of the consummation of the marriage, and a cohabitation of five months was sufficient to confirm the fact in the opinion of the English nation<sup>z</sup>. At the expiration of this period, Arthur died; but so confident was the expectation of issue from the marriage, that the title of Prince of Wales was not conferred on Henry, Duke of

<sup>z</sup> Lord Herbert of Cherbury's Life of Henry VIII. p. 275.

York, for a considerable time after the death of his brother.

The alliance between England and Spain being thus weakened by the untimely death of Arthur, Henry the Seventh proposed that it should be again cemented by a second marriage between Catherine and his younger son Henry, now heir apparent to the throne. Fully was he aware that objections might be alleged against the legality of an union with the widow of a deceased brother, but he thought that they might be obviated by a papal dispensation. Julius the Second, always watchful over the temporal interests of the holy see, saw that by this measure the league would be strengthened against his great enemy the King of France; and he required little solicitation to promote it by his sanction. On the petition of Prince Henry and Catherine, he granted a bull, authorizing their marriage if it had not already taken place, or, if it had already taken place, confirming it after the imposition by their confessor of some wholesome penance. The legality and the probable consummation of the marriage<sup>a</sup> between Catherine and Prince Arthur were distinctly admitted in the dispensation; and the cause assigned, both for the petition of the contracting parties and for the consent of the Pope to the petition, was the preservation of peace and amity between the kingdoms of England and Spain<sup>b</sup>.

Throughout the whole of this transaction, Warham, then Archbishop of Canterbury, and Lord Chancellor, manifested a steady and strenuous opposition. He delivered his opinion with firmness and freedom on the illegality and impolicy of such an union. He represented it to be contrary to the laws of God, and dishonourable to the kingdom of England. He knew that such a measure

<sup>a</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Ut vinclum pacis et amicitiae inter praefatos reges et reginam diutius permaneat. Ibid.

would excite popular discontent, and that national feuds were likely to arise concerning the succession to the crown, if there should be any issue from a marriage whose illegality was so evident.

The remonstrances of Warham were ineffectual in preventing Henry the Seventh from obtaining the papal dispensation; but, by the pertinacity with which they were urged, they operated so powerfully as to prevent the execution of the dispensation when obtained. The parties were espoused, but the Prince at that time was too young to complete the contract, and Henry the Seventh changed his resolution of enforcing its completion. On the day when his son was of age, he commanded the young Prince to make a protestation, in the presence of several of the nobility, and which was deposited in the hands of Fox, Bishop of Winchester. It was to the following effect: that whereas he had been contracted in matrimony, when under age, to the Princess Catherine, yet then, being of full age, he retracted and annulled his consent; that he would never proceed in the contract, or complete it; but intended in full form of law to make it void; and that this retraction was made freely and without compulsion <sup>c</sup>.

Henry the Seventh survived the date of this protestation four years, and during the remainder of his life continued adverse to the completion of the contract. From his experience of the wars between the houses of York and Lancaster, he knew that no alliance, however advantageous, could compensate the evils of a controverted title to the crown. On his death-bed he solemnly charged his son to adhere to the terms of the protestation, and entirely to break off from a marriage portending the most disastrous consequences.

On the accession of Henry the Eighth to his father's throne, one of the first questions submitted

1509

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* vol. i. b. ii. no. 2.

to the deliberation of the council was, whether the young King should finally rescind or complete the contract? Arguments were brought on both sides. However Warham might relax in his active opposition, yet he adhered to his original opinion on the illegality of the marriage. But the King was prevailed on by the majority of his council to complete the contract, in contradiction to his own deliberate protestation, in disobedience to the dying injunction of his father, and, it has been even said, in repugnance to his own inclinations. Six weeks after he ascended the throne he was publicly married to the Princess Catherine, and soon afterwards the King and Queen joined in the ceremony of a coronation.

Whatever evils had been predicted by the opponents of the marriage, were completely verified by the event. The Queen was many years older than Henry; and his affection, never strong, was extinguished with the wane of her personal attractions. Two sons, which she had borne in the earlier years of their union, died in their infancy. Their only surviving offspring was the Princess Mary; and in her, the evil of female succession to the throne often to be deprecated, was aggravated by a doubt of her legitimacy.

When Henry could expect no farther issue, he created his daughter Mary, Princess of Wales, and his great object was to find for her a suitable alliance. As his political interests vibrated between France and Spain, he negotiated a treaty of marriage with the Sovereigns of both these countries. The Emperor Charles, who was the nephew of Catherine, had a personal interview with Henry, and was betrothed to his cousin in her infancy; but the compact was broken by the Emperor, with the advice of his cortes, on the ostensible ground of the questionable legitimacy of the Princess. Francis had twice proposed an union between Mary and the royal family of France, first with the Dauphin, and then with the Duke of

Orleans; but the last of these treaties was suspended, by the advice of the Bishop of Tarbes the French ambassador, till the legitimacy of the Princess was ascertained.

The insinuation is not improbable, that these doubts concerning the legitimacy of his daughter might have been secretly encouraged by Henry after he contemplated a divorce from Catherine; but it is certain that they were previously agitated without his connivance or knowledge, and that they must then have been the source to him of the greatest inquietude. A marriage of the female heir to the English Crown with the presumptive heir of the Crown of France would have reduced England to the condition of a French province. A measure so fatal to national independence would naturally have induced the English people to take advantage of the doubtful legitimacy of Mary; and it is reasonable to suppose that, after the death of her father, rival claimants to the throne would have asserted their pretensions.

Wolsey was a statesman of too great penetration not to foresee this evil; and however he might have disapproved of the object of Henry's passion, and the substitution of Anne Boleyn in the place of Catherine, yet of the divorce itself he must, on principle, have approved. It was his inclination to exchange the aunt of Charles for the sister of Francis, and in this he only seconded the wishes of the English nation; for these decidedly pointed to the Duchess d'Alençon. From many of his letters it appears that he had undertaken to carry through this great national measure; and although he miscalculated his ability, and over-rated his influence with the Pope and the sacred College, there is no reason to doubt his sincerity. In his embassy to France, while the Pope was in confinement, the divorce of Henry was one of the articles of private negociation; and when the Pontiff had escaped to Orvieto, and was no longer under the inspection of the imperial

guard, the subject, by Wolsey's suggestion, was propounded in due form.

The management of this delicate business was committed by Wolsey to the secretary Knight, who was sent on an extraordinary embassy, and to Sir Gregory Cassali, the ordinary ambassador at the Court of Rome. The question naturally divided itself into two parts: 1. Whether a marriage with the wife of a deceased brother was contrary to the law of God and of the Church? 2. Whether, supposing such a marriage to be unlawful, it could be rendered lawful by a papal dispensation? Both these questions, in the sequel, occasioned a long and fierce controversy; but in the present stage of the proceeding neither of them was agitated. The affirmative of both was clearly admitted. It was admitted that such a marriage was, if not unlawful, at least irregular and uncanonical; because a dispensation presupposes a previous irregularity or defect. But it was admitted that such a marriage could be legalized by a papal dispensation; because it would have been equally absurd and indecorous for those to have questioned the papal power, who sought its remedial interposition. The extent of the Pope's power, not its existence, was debated; for the English ambassadors contended, that the Pope could not dispense in a case of the nearest degree of affinity without the most cogent reasons.

At this period, the aim of the English suitors in the consistory of Rome was to save the honour and infallibility of the Apostolic See without prejudice to their cause. To effect this, they endeavoured to find such errors in the Bull of Julius the Second, authorizing the marriage of Henry and Catherine, as might render it a nullity. It is a maxim in the canon law, that if a Bull be granted on the suggestion of any material falsehood, or the suppression of any material truth, it is void; and such contradictions and omissions the canonists employed by Henry had discovered in the papal dispensation.

In the preamble of the bull it was suggested, that Prince Henry had petitioned the Pope to grant a dispensation for his marriage with the Princess Catherine, and that the dispensation was granted in consequence of such a petition. This, it was contended, was a false suggestion, because, at that time Prince Henry was only twelve years of age. It was also stated in the preamble, that the motive of Prince Henry, in desiring a marriage with the Princess Catherine, was the preservation of peace between the two kingdoms of England and Spain. To this suggestion it was objected, that a youth of twelve years could never desire a marriage on political considerations so refined and subtile. In the body of the dispensation it was suggested, that the motive which urged the Pope to grant it was to preserve peace between the two kingdoms. This was another false suggestion; because there was no danger of any breach between them, and therefore the Pope was moved by a false representation of a danger that did not exist. In addition to these errors, both Henry the Seventh of England, and Isabella of Spain, were dead before the completion of the contract; so that a marriage could not be valid by virtue of a Bull granted to maintain amity between those potentates. The canonists were also of opinion, that Prince Henry, by his protestation after he was of age, retracted any pretended desire that he might have expressed during his nonage. A presumed desire, expressed during his minority, was controverted by his actual protestation when he had arrived at competence of judgment and action; therefore a marriage founded on a dispensation, purporting to be granted on such a presumed desire, must be null and void.

On these grounds the English canonists and divines advised the prosecution of the suit, and by such arguments the cause of Henry was to be publicly defended. The ambassadors also received private instructions, and, in the credentials which they were to deliver to the Pope, an

earnest clause was added in the King's own hand. They were commanded to represent the devoted attachment of the King of England to the holy See, the solicitude and exertions both of the King and the Cardinal of York to obtain the complete release of the head of the Church, and to assure the holy father that the latter would employ himself with as much industry to effect it as his ecclesiastical station demanded, and as his temporal influence enabled. They were also forcibly to depict the condition of Italy and of Christendom; the one desolated by the imperial armies, the other distracted by the Lutheran heresy. They were instructed to expatiate on the treachery of the Emperor, on the insincerity of his amicable professions, compared with the fidelity of the English King in the performance of his engagements. They were finally to impress on the mind of the Pope, that a ready compliance with the solicitation then preferred would unite the King to the holy See in the bonds of a warm and indissoluble friendship<sup>d</sup>.

When these representations were first made by the secretary Knight, it was not at a personal interview, because the Pope was then under the custody of the imperial guard. The sum of Henry's wishes and demands was privately communicated to the imprisoned Pontiff, and he at once signified his willingness to accede. It has been asserted, that a dispensation and a commission for expediting the divorce were executed by Clement while in confinement; but they were deemed invalid, because executed under a restraint on his liberty.

But when the business was publicly opened at Orvieto, jointly by Knight and Cassali, the Pope, though he expressed the warmest sentiments of gratitude towards the King of England, was slow in purpose, but still more tardy in action. It was soon evident to the ambassadors that he was anxious to exonerate himself from the chief responsi-

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. vol. i. b. ii. no. iii.

bility in the affair. He insinuated, that if the King were convinced of the illegality of his marriage, he might venture to take another wife, and then the whole matter might be brought to a speedy decision<sup>e</sup>. He urged that the imperialists had not retreated from Rome, and that Lautrec, though at the head of a powerful army, could not advance in the winter season to regain possession of the capital of the ecclesiastical state. He also professed his own inexperience, and ignorance of the canon law, and complained that the most able members of the conclave, to whom he usually resorted for advice in cases of this nature, were still detained as hostages.

At length, however, in consequence of the persevering application of the ambassadors, and by the assistance and advice of one of the Cardinals<sup>f</sup>, a dispensation and commission were reluctantly granted. The Pope professed all the readiness to comply with Henry's wishes which could be expected in his critical circumstances: the imperial forces were not far distant from him, and were ravaging the country round Orvieto.

The English ambassadors had been instructed to move, that a legation might be appointed to try the cause in England, and the Pope would have agreed to the proposition, if he had not been awed by the neighbourhood of the imperial troops: he acknowledged to Cassali that this would be the preferable mode of determining the question, but he desired the ambassador to signify that this was the opinion of some of his Cardinals rather than his own.

When the dispensation and the commission were exhibited in England, a general dissatisfaction prevailed,

<sup>e</sup> Clement said, "The King appears to me to have taken the most circuitous route. If he be convinced that his marriage is null, let him marry again. This will enable me or the legate to decide the question at once." Lingard's History of England, vol. vi. c. iii. p. 173. See also Sir Greg. Cassali's despatch, dated Orvieto, 13th Jan. 1527. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. vi.

<sup>f</sup> The Cardinal 'Sanctorum Quatuor,' or 'Santi Quatri.'

because they were not sufficiently explicit and decisive. Staphileus, Dean of the Rota, being then at the Court of Henry, was sent by Wolsey to Rome. Through him, the Cardinal addressed an earnest epistle to the Pope, soliciting a more ample commission, and renewing his entreaties for a speedy and favourable termination of the suit. By the same hand he sent to Cassali, instructing him to move the Pope to grant a plenary commission for the trial of the cause in England. He requested that another Cardinal might be joined in the commission with himself, and pointed out the Cardinal Campeggio as the most eligible member of the sacred College.

To strengthen the English interest at the Court of Rome, the embassy received an important accession. Not only Staphileus was retained in the service of Henry, but Wolsey specially deputed Stephen Gardiner his private secretary, and Edmund Fox the King's almoner. Gardiner was supposed to be the most eminent canonist, and Fox the most able theologian, in the kingdom, and they were both skilled in the arts of diplomacy. Wolsey again renewed his solicitations to the Pope in terms at once indicative of his sincerity, and of his fears for his own safety, if the cause were not quickly determined according to the wishes of his sovereign. He added also his apprehensions, that if the Pope were so intimidated by the Emperor, as not to grant that which all Christendom judged to be right and lawful, both the King of England and other Christian princes would seek different remedies, and despise the authority of the holy See. He concluded with a solemn protestation, that neither partiality, nor love of his prince, nor the bond of servitude, impelled him to urge his request, but that he was guided only by rectitude of intention <sup>s</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> Hæc loquor ut Christianus et ut devotissimum istius sedis membrum sinceré suadeo: non affectus, non principis amor, non servitutis vinculum me impellit, sed solâ rectitudine ad id adducor. Feb. 10, 1528. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. viii.

When Gardiner and Fox joined the English embassy, the imperialists had withdrawn from Rome, of which they had kept possession during ten months. Clement then returned to the capital of the ecclesiastical state, and felt nothing of captivity but the remembrance. Bitter indeed must that remembrance have been, for it completely enthralled his mind. He had painfully experienced, that the evils of hostility are aggravated by its vicinity, and he knew, that though the treasure of England had been and might be again available in procuring his liberty, yet that her armies were too distant to prevent a recurrence of his late calamity. Fear was always a stronger motive with him than gratitude, and it often inclined him to his enemy rather than his benefactor.

But in spite of the timidity and indecision of Clement, the applications of the English ambassadors were urged with such pertinacity, that a commission for trying the cause in England was at last granted. The Pope, in open consistory, appointed Cardinal Campeggio and the Cardinal of York his legates on this occasion, with full powers to determine the validity of the marriage between Henry and Catherine.

Of the character of Campeggio, thus selected by the Pope, at the suggestion of Wolsey, something must be said. He possessed great influence in the sacred College, and was conversant with the forensic business of the Apostolic See. Frequently he had been intrusted with negotiations of difficulty, and particularly at the second Diet of the empire assembled at Nuremberg. He there artfully eluded the demands of the Diet for the assembling of a General Council, and for the redress of ecclesiastical grievances<sup>h</sup>. As his public character was marked by a love of intrigue, so his private life was distinguished by laxity of morals. Among his many lucrative preferments

<sup>h</sup> Sleidan Comment. de Stat. Rel. et Rep. lib. iv. Bohun's Trans. p. 66.

he possessed the Bishopric of Salisbury, and this circumstance rendered his appointment as one of the legates gratifying to Henry.

The legation was not absolutely refused by Campeggio, but was accepted with unfeigned reluctance. Whatever might be the event of the suit, he must be necessarily involved in a quarrel either with the King of England or the Emperor. He therefore used every mode of address to avoid the appointment, and, when he could not succeed, he resorted to every excuse for procrastinating his journey. He pleaded his infirm health, and consequent inability to travel, and his high and responsible situation at Rome. His excuses were obviated by Wolsey; and at length, wearied with importunity, he proceeded to England. Campeggio brought with him a decretal Bull, authorizing the divorce, if the legates, after a full hearing, were satisfied of the invalidity of the marriage.

Although the ambassadors of England, stimulated by Henry and Wolsey, had succeeded so far as to obtain a commission of legation and a decretal Bull, many difficulties were yet to be overcome. By the canon law, the papal power is so absolute, that no general clauses in commissions to legates can bind the Pope to confirm their decisions. The infallibility of the supreme head of the Church is incommunicable even by himself; and it is doubtful whether a promise, or what is technically styled a pollicitation, to confirm the decisions of any subordinate functionary, is obligatory on the sovereign Pontiff.

Thus Henry was soon convinced, that the dilatory and tortuous pace of the ecclesiastical law was of itself sufficient to tire his ardent expectations, and they were doomed to sustain a stronger and a positive counteraction. From the time when the subject of the divorce was first agitated, the Emperor without reserve declared himself on the side of his aunt. Henry had entertained a false persuasion, that the former scruples of Charles, concerning the legitimacy

of the Princess Mary, would have prevented his open support of the validity of her mother's marriage; but in such a persuasion he was not suffered long to remain. At the commencement of the suit, Charles gave the strongest assurances to the English Queen, that he would vigorously support her rights.

By commensurate steps, he proceeded with the English Court and with the English embassy, and his agents were employed to defeat the schemes of both. As the canonists on the side of Henry began their prosecution of the suit by taking verbal exceptions to the Bull of Julius the Second, Charles commenced by employing other canonists to invalidate the force of these exceptions. A Breve was therefore found or forged in Spain, which supplied all the errors and amended all the defects of the original Bull. In the preamble of the Bull, an exception had been taken, that Henry and Catherine had petitioned for a dispensation to marry in order to preserve peace between England and Spain. In the preamble of the Breve, the exception was obviated; the reason of their petition was there declared to be, "because otherwise it was not likely that peace would continue," and for that, and divers other reasons, they desired to marry. There was, however, one admission in the Breve, which involved a strong suspicion of its genuineness, and was eventually turned against Catherine's cause. In the Bull, it was alleged only that her marriage with Prince Arthur had, perhaps, been consummated, but in the Breve it was said positively that the parties had consummated the marriage. This declaration was in direct contradiction to the asseveration which the Queen afterwards made in open court with such impression and effect, and it afforded a presumption that the Breve had been fabricated to serve a particular purpose. The consummation of the marriage was not then questioned, it was neither affirmed by one party nor denied by the other: the only matter of debate then was concerning the false

suggestions of the Bull. An inference was naturally drawn that the Breve was fabricated cautiously, to obviate the objections then insisted on, and negligently, with respect to another material point not then discussed. But not only the internal evidence preponderated against the genuineness of the Breve, but the external evidence was decisive. The instrument was not found in the public archives of Spain, but was said to be discovered among the papers of de Puebla, the Spanish ambassador at the Court of Henry the Seventh.

The friends of Catherine acquired no reputation to themselves, and rendered no service to her, by resorting to this mode of defending the validity of her marriage; but they argued with fairness and force against the trial of the cause in England. No sooner was the commission granted to the legates, than the Emperor, in the name of Catherine, protested against the legation, and declared her refusal to submit to its authority. Of the two legates joined in the commission, Wolsey was the King's chief minister, and her avowed enemy; Campeggio, as Bishop of Salisbury, was the King's subject, and owed obedience. The Emperor pressed an avocation of the suit to Rome, where the cause would be heard with impartiality, and where the decision would be without appeal.

The two legates, though impelled by different motives, agreed in opinion that the cause ought not to be tried in England, but that it should be remitted to the papal decision. They had fruitlessly endeavoured to persuade both parties to yield; Henry to relinquish his suit, and Catherine to resign her title. They concurred in representing to the Pope the agitation of the King's mind; that he was so much disquieted by the disputes of divines, and the decrees of fathers, as to require not only a more than common share of learning, but an extraordinary degree of piety and illumination, for resolving his perplexities. They thought an avocation of the cause preferable

to its determination by themselves ; but the measure most strongly recommended by them was a decretal Bull, for which many precedents could be adduced<sup>i</sup>.

Whatever might be pretended of the partiality of Campeggio to the cause of Henry, it is evident that his inclinations and his interests were on the other side. His only connexion with England was the Bishopric of Salisbury, and the loss of this preferment could be easily compensated either by the Emperor or the Pope. He was equally insincere with Clement, but his was the insincerity of management, not of cowardice. Clement, through dread of the impending wrath of Charles, and of an ultimate rupture with Henry, sent Campana to England, with an injunction to Campeggio to destroy the decretal Bull, while, by the same messenger, he soothed the English King with the assurance that the suit should be terminated in his favour. Campeggio, fearless of consequences, refused to submit the decretal Bull to the inspection of the English council, and even to leave it with the King or Wolsey, while he amused Henry with the most specious promises, and the most delusive expectations of the papal sanction to his divorce.

As to Wolsey, he saw the gathering storm which, whenever it fell, was certain to involve him in ruin ; and he could find no way of extricating himself from the difficulties which surrounded him. He was rapidly declining in the favour of his sovereign, who attributed the delay of the divorce rather to the treachery of his minister than the tergiversation of the Pope. To Catherine he had never been acceptable, for she suspected, either causelessly or not, that he had infused conscientious scruples into the King's mind concerning the validity of her marriage, and she had always shown a dislike of the licentiousness of his morals. From Anne Boleyn, if she succeeded Catherine

<sup>i</sup> Letter of the legates to the Pope. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. xxiv.

as the royal consort, he could expect no favour; she had exasperated Henry's natural impatience against him; she was, in fact, the "weight" by which he was at last dragged from his pinnacle of worldly grandeur. The political hostility of the Emperor against him had been of long continuance, and it was now sharpened into personal hatred. If he ever possessed the friendship of the Pope, he had now forfeited it: while Clement laboured under a dangerous sickness, he had renewed his intrigues for the papal chair, and he was regarded by the convalescent Pontiff with that antipathy which most men feel towards an aspirant after their reversionary dignities. To the nobility and the people of England, his haughty demeanour and his profuse expenditure had rendered him peculiarly obnoxious, and the earliest indications of displeasure were anxiously expected by those flatterers of royalty who "watch the sign to hate."

It is difficult at this distance of time to assign the true reason why Henry suffered a trial to proceed, from which he could not reasonably expect a favourable issue, and none of the parties could expect a conclusive adjustment. Perhaps he might have been deluded by the fair promises of Campeggio, perhaps he thought that the strength of his arguments must prevail, even against the secret wishes of the legates; but, whatever were his reasons, the formality of a trial was at last determined. Gardiner was recalled from Rome to conduct the King's cause, for his presence was deemed to be so essential, that no proceedings could take place before his arrival. Previously to his departure from Rome, he was instructed to expostulate with the Pope on his partiality towards the Emperor, and on the failure of his friendly professions towards the King of England.

The imperialists, alarmed at the recall of Gardiner, and advertised that the process was going on in England, began to plead strenuously for an avocation of the cause to Rome. The English ambassadors, who still remained,

were instructed to reply that no process had yet commenced, and that, before its commencement, either an inhibition of the proceedings, or an avocation of the cause, would be informal.

When the process had actually commenced, and the motion for an avocation was renewed, the English ambassadors obviated it in a different manner. They contended that such a measure would involve the character of the legates, and that it would be a violation of the Pope's written promise. They represented that the King of England could not appear at Rome, either in person or by proxy, without a derogation from his royal prerogative. They intimated that the nobility of England were decidedly friendly to the divorce, and in case it was refused, they would withdraw their allegiance from the holy See with the King at their head.

The imperialists having declined to send the original Breve to England, on which they so much relied, and having urged this as a plea for the decision of the cause at Rome, the English met the objection by offering to proceed to trial upon the attested copy of the Breve already sent from Spain.

While the imperial party was thus pressing an avocation of the cause to Rome, the preparations were completed for the trial in England. It was indeed a singular spectacle to see a sovereign prince and his consort presenting themselves as suitors in the court of a foreign potentate held "within their own realm and dominion<sup>k</sup>." The place allotted for the session of the court was at Blackfriars, in a room called the parliament chamber: the King and Queen during the time of the trial resided in the contiguous palace of Bridewell, and Campeggio from the time of his arrival in England was lodged in Bath place.

Though Wolsey was the elder Cardinal<sup>l</sup>, yet he yielded

<sup>k</sup> Cavendish's Life of Wolsey.

<sup>l</sup> Wolsey was created a Cardinal Sept. 7, 1515; Campeggio July 1, 1517. Baker's Notes on Burnet's Hist. Ref.

the precedence to Campeggio, partly to give a colour of impartiality to the proceedings, and partly from a disinclination to take the lead in a transaction of which he foresaw the unsuccessful result. The King, by a warrant under the Great Seal, had previously granted his license to the legates to execute their commission, and the court held its first sitting on the same day that the license was received. The counsel employed on behalf of the King were under the direction of Gardiner, of whom the chief were Samson, Dean of the Chapel, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, and Bell, afterwards Bishop of Worcester. The Queen was supported by Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Standish, Bishop of Saint Asaph. On her side also appeared Ridley, a doctor of canon and civil law, “a very small person of stature, but surely a great and learned clerk in divinity<sup>m</sup>.”

The commission of legation was presented by Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, the King’s confessor, and after being read by the protonotary of the court, the legates took it in their hands, and swore to execute it faithfully. A citation was then issued for the appearance of the King and Queen at the next sitting. The citations having been duly executed, the King appeared in court by his proxies; the Queen appeared in person, and protested against the incompetence of the legates, alleging that the cause was already avocated by the Pope. This allegation, at her desire, she was allowed a future day to prove.

The historian, in relating the proceedings of the third session, of that memorable day when both Henry and Catherine dignified the court by their personal appearance and by their pleadings, will consider brevity and succinctness as qualities not dictated by indolence, but imposed on him by modesty. He will contentedly refer his reader to the graphical detail of Hall and Cavendish, and will leave the character of Catherine, as well as Wolsey, in the

<sup>m</sup> Cavendish’s Life of Wolsey.

hands of Shakspeare. The Queen having made her affecting appeal to Henry in the presence of the whole court, retired, and never appeared again. After her departure, Henry fully exculpated Wolsey from the insinuation frequently urged against him, that through his artifices Longland had infused scruples into the King's mind concerning the lawfulness of his marriage. The King, on this occasion, unequivocally declared that the doubts originated in himself.

At the next session, which was the day allowed for the Queen to prove her allegation, her counsel brought in her appeal. She excepted to the place of trial, to her judges, and even to her counsel, in whom she could not confide. On these accounts she appealed, and referred her cause to the Pope, proving that her appeal was grounded on many precedents of the canon law. The appeal having been read in court, but the Queen herself not appearing, she was declared contumacious. The legates then proceeded to draw up articles on which the witnesses were to be examined, according to the practice of the civil and canon law. The point chiefly insisted on at this sitting by the King's counsel was the consummation of the marriage between Prince Arthur and the Queen. When Fisher and Ridley objected to the indelicacy of detail which the discussion of this question must necessarily involve, they were sharply reproved by Wolsey.

The legates proceeded in the examination of witnesses, and were thus occupied during several sessions. The court issued a second citation, commanding the Queen to appear, and on her refusal, she was a second time pronounced contumacious. On a subsequent day, the Bull of Julius the Second, and an attested copy of the Breve found in Spain, were produced, and the King's counsel argued against the validity of the one and the genuineness of the other. The counsel having, in the course of argument, contended that the Pope's power of dispensation did not

extend to any prohibitions of the divine law, Campeggio interposed, and refused to hear the authority of the Pope questioned or limited in any court wherein he presided. The two following sessions were employed in taking the depositions of the remaining witnesses, which were afterwards published.

There can be no doubt that Campeggio had received secret instructions to protract the cause till an avocation was granted. When the protestation of Henry against the marriage had been read and verified, Gardiner summed up the evidence, and in the King's name prayed that sentence might be given. But Campeggio pretended that an interval ought to elapse between the close of the evidence and the sentence; he therefore adjourned the court for two days.

On the last session, as a general expectation prevailed that July 23. a definitive sentence would be pronounced, the court was thronged with the nobility and other persons of distinction. Campeggio had no other concern on his own account, than to terminate the business with a plausible oration. He was about to leave England for ever, for a soil more congenial to his temperament, and a sphere better adapted to his talents. His speech began with professions of his own impartiality, and of his disregard to the favour or censure of any human being however exalted. "What would it avail me," he asked, "to put my soul in hazard of God's displeasure for the praise of any man however great, even of my prince? I am now old, of feeble body, and of short continuance here." He adverted to the appeal of the Queen against the decision of the legates, on the ground of their presumed partiality, as being subjects of the King of England. For this reason she had exhibited no answer, and had not taken any part in the proceedings; therefore, to avoid all ambiguities and doubts, he declined to take any farther step until he had received the advice of the Pope, or some other person of

greater experience than himself. The court in which he then presided was a branch of the consistory of Rome, and the legates were bound to conform to its rules of proceeding. The consistory never sat during the summer vacation, and he should observe the same custom; therefore he adjourned the court for three months, and thus pronounced its dissolution. Long before the expiration of the vacation, there arrived in England, what Campeggio knew was about to be decreed<sup>o</sup>, AN AVOCATION OF THE CAUSE TO ROME.

### CHAPTER III.

Indignation of Henry.—Disgrace of Wolsey.—Rise of Cranmer.—He writes a Treatise in favour of the Divorce.—Decisions of the English Universities in its favour; and of many foreign Universities; and of many eminent individuals.—Address of the English Nobility and Gentry to the Pope.—The Pope's Rescript.—Death of Wolsey.—Parliament and Convocation assembled.—The Clergy involved in a *Præmunire*.—Statutes enacted in prejudice of the papal Authority.—Remonstrance of Henry to the Pope.—Its consequences.—Resignation of Sir Thomas More.—Death of Warham.

AT the time when the court was thus abruptly dissolved by Campeggio, several of the nobility were present, and the King himself was in a contiguous apartment. His indignation at the moment may easily be conceived, and it communicated itself to his nobles. The Duke of Suffolk came from the gallery where the King was, and said with great vehemence, “It was never merry in England since we had any Cardinals among us.” This severe taunt was at first suffered to pass unnoticed; but on its repetition, Wolsey, in a calm manner, vindicated the proceedings of the court. He went farther, and, in answer to the reflection

<sup>o</sup> The avocation was decreed at Rome three days after this session.

on the order to which he belonged, alluded to an instance of the Duke of Suffolk's personal obligation to himself<sup>p</sup>. The allusion has invited and baffled the conjectures of subsequent historians, but it was at the time perfectly understood by the Duke. It was not only intelligible, but efficacious, for “the Duke gave over the matter without any further wordes or aunswer, and went his way<sup>q</sup>.”

After the first ebullition of anger, the resentment of Henry against the legates, and the Pope himself, was for a time suppressed. Campeggio was admitted to an audience before his departure to Rome, and received not only professions of kindness and esteem, but a munificent reward. Even the fate of Wolsey was undetermined for an interval of three months, and he was treated with complacency, though not with confidence. Then, however, his suspense was converted into a fearful certainty. The first public mark of displeasure was his removal from the office of Lord Chancellor, which he gave up with reluctance, and refused to resign on a verbal message from the King, conveyed to him by the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk. Deprived of his high political office, he was next indicted on the statute of *præmunire*, for exercising his legatine authority in the realm of England, though he had the license of his sovereign for his violation of an obsolete law. Of this offence he, without hesitation, confessed himself guilty, committing himself to the clemency of the King. By such a confession, he incurred the penalty of confiscation of goods, a penalty which was exacted with unrelenting rigour. He was commanded to retire from the Court to Esher, a house then belonging to the see of Winchester, where the necessaries of life were supplied by the few faithful servants whom adversity could not

<sup>p</sup> “If I poore Cardinall had not bine, you should have had at this present no head upon your shoulders wherewith you might make any such bragge.”—Cavendish's Life of Wolsey, p. 437.

<sup>q</sup> Cavendish's Life of Wolsey, p. 438.

alienate. His confiscated property was restored to him by the King in such a scanty measure, as was calculated rather to insult his misery than to relieve his wants.

All these injuries were borne by Wolsey, not with magnanimity, but without remonstrance, and generally without complaint. On one occasion alone, the flagrant injustice of his treatment extorted from him something like a rebuke. The King, by one of the Judges (Shelley), signified to the disgraced Cardinal, that York-house, a demesne of the archbishopric, should be surrendered, and converted into a regal palace. Wolsey, after having fully shown the illegality of the demand, and the impolicy of yielding to it, submitted; but by the messenger who conveyed his extorted assent, he ventured to remind his incensed master of a truth which, when in the enjoyment of favour, he had perhaps never whispered into the royal ear, and which he had himself, too probably, forgotten. He humbly implored his sovereign graciously to remember, that there is both a heaven and a hell<sup>r</sup>.

Before the disgrace of Wolsey, Henry had sent by Gardiner a protest to Rome, against the avocation, and a refusal to appear there either in person or by proxy. It was, he stated, derogatory to the rights of his Crown to suffer himself to be cited into a foreign court. He also protested against the manner in which the commission to the legates was declared void; contending that it should have been revoked by a declaratory breve, and not by an avocation<sup>s</sup>.

With the removal of Wolsey from the councils of Henry, a new system of policy commenced. The office of Lord Chancellor, after being refused by Warham, was conferred on Sir Thomas More, and thus was disunited, for the first time, from the Church. A Parliament, which had not assembled for seven years before, was summoned, as the

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. p. 469.

<sup>s</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. ii. p. 156.

King resolved to ascertain the opinions of his people on the late events, and to be aided by their counsels with respect to his future conduct.

The progress of the doctrines of the Reformation had now considerably advanced, for the Reformers, being friendly to the King's divorce, had escaped persecution. The House of Commons appeared to have strongly imbibed this spirit, for three Bills were introduced, levelled immediately against the exorbitant power of the Clergy, and ultimately against the see of Rome. The first was against exactions for probates of wills<sup>t</sup>; the second against excessive mortuaries or corse presents<sup>u</sup>; and the third against pluralities, non-residence, and farming by the Clergy<sup>x</sup>. In the statute against pluralities, the authority of the Pope was directly attacked, since all dispensations from Rome or elsewhere, contrary to the Act, were declared null and void.

When these Bills were brought up to the House of Lords, they were supported by the temporal Peers, and as strongly opposed by the Prelates. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, in the course of debate, cast a severe reflection on the House of Commons, accusing them of a design to overthrow the Church of England, and adverted to the kingdom of Bohemia, reduced by heresy to the lowest state of misery: he ended his speech with the observation, "All this was for lack of faith." This observation having been reported to the Commons, that House sent its Speaker, with thirty other members, complaining to the King, that the Bishop of Rochester had thrown an imputation on the whole English nation through its representatives. The King referred the complaint to the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other Bishops, and to them Fisher vindicated himself by an explanation, that his assertion referred to the kingdom of Bohemia, and not to England. This explanation was sent by order of the

<sup>t</sup> 21 Hen. VIII. c. 5.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. c. 6.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. c. 13.

King to the House of Commons, and though not entirely satisfactory, was accepted. But the three Bills, notwithstanding the opposition of the spirituality, passed the House of Lords, and received the royal assent.

It has been said that Wolsey was admitted to sit in this Parliament<sup>y</sup>, but it is evident he never appeared there. He continued during the whole time at Esher, expecting an impeachment. In the House of Lords he had many enemies, and a charge of high misdemeanours was there exhibited against him; but the prosecution was stopped in the Commons, through the influence of his faithful servant, Thomas Cromwell<sup>z</sup>.

When Henry was convinced from the conduct of the Parliament, during even its short session, that the authority of the See of Rome was declining in the estimation of the people; when he also perceived that the sentiments both of the nobility and the nation, and even of many ecclesiastics, were favourable to his divorce; the possibility of accomplishing his wishes without the intervention of the Pope naturally suggested itself. The prejudices of his education, his controversial achievements, the influence of his favourite minister Wolsey, had all contributed to confirm his attachment to the apostolic see, and from ties so strong he could not break away without a violent effort. But this effort was facilitated by an accession of counsel and exertion, the more grateful because unexpected. Henry, among his other faults, was not the slave of favouritism, and Wolsey, in his last moments, gave testimony to the inflexible obstinacy of his master. Yet though he would never submit to absolute control, there were seasons when he was not impenetrable to conviction; he even loved freedom of speech, when it flowed from sincerity and singleness of heart. These qualities he honoured sometimes by his commendation and reward, and some-

<sup>y</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. ii. p. 166.

<sup>z</sup> Cavendish's Life of Wolsey, p. 462.

times by an obedience to their dictates; and these qualities he found, and loved, in Cranmer.

To bring before the notice of the reader a personage who acted so prominent a part in the reformation of the English Church without a single prefatory remark, would be an abrupt and unsuitable introduction. To attempt the delineation of a character which will be fully developed in the sequel of the history, would be an injudicious anticipation of its events.

The character of Cranmer cannot, however, be entirely passed over without comment, even at this point of the narrative, because its crimination has been a favourite mode of aggression with the advocates of the Romish Church. The Protestant may undoubtedly repel the aggression, by replying, that truth is equally "mighty," by whatever lips it may be uttered; that error is not altered, because it may be attacked from unworthy motives; and that argument is equally incontrovertible, by whatever hand it may be wielded. Thus he may fearlessly meet his opponents; but with respect even to the point of general character, he has no reason to decline the challenge. The English reformers, although encompassed with the failings of humanity, were raised far above its ordinary standard, and Cranmer, with many imperfections, is not unworthy of the place which he holds in the veneration of the Church of England.

Among the other accusations preferred against the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, one is immediately connected with his elevation. His sudden rise, it is affirmed, is attributable solely to his conduct with respect to the divorce of Henry and Catherine, and his culpability is founded on the presumption that the marriage was originally valid.

It is a sufficient vindication of Cranmer, that his opinion on the validity of the marriage was not entertained on light grounds, and that it was not entertained by himself alone.

If he promoted the divorce, he promoted it in common with the most able men of those times; in common with his predecessor, Warham, and his antagonist, Gardiner; in accordance not only with the popular voice, but with the avowed sentiments of the English nobility; in conjunction not only with the friends of the Reformation, but with many of its most implacable enemies.

The introduction of Cranmer into public life, and his consequent advancement, arose out of one of those seemingly unimportant accidents which produce a train of great events. He was then a Fellow of Jesus College in the University of Cambridge; his Fellowship had been vacated by his marriage, but on the death of his wife he was re-elected into his former situation. Such was his reputation for theological learning, that he was offered the lectureship in divinity in the college then recently founded at Oxford by Cardinal Wolsey. This offer he declined to accept, and continued at Cambridge, employed in the pursuit of his favourite studies, and in the education of youth.

While the Court was in its progress at Waltham, Cranmer with two of his pupils was there, being obliged to leave Cambridge on account of the plague. Gardiner and Fox were both in attendance on the King, and were lodged in the same house where Cranmer resided. He was known both to the Secretary and Almoner, not only by reputation, but by personal acquaintance, and they were naturally induced to hear his sentiments on a topic which generally engrossed conversation. The legates had suspended their decision, and had adjourned the court; the avocation of the cause to Rome had been decreed; and Campeggio had taken leave of the King, just at the time when this interview happened.

At first Cranmer declined to give an opinion on a question of such magnitude; but on being strongly pressed stated, that, in his judgment, the most satisfactory way of arriving at a determination was merely to ascertain whether

the marriage was contrary to the law of God. If that point were decided, then no dispensation from the Pope could make that lawful which by the Divine law was unlawful. For this reason, he thought that, instead of a protracted and fruitless negociation at Rome, it would be preferable to consult the Universities and the learned men of Christendom. If these determined that the marriage was contrary to the law of God, the Pope, urged by such an authority, would be compelled to proceed to a definitive sentence; or the papal dispensation for the marriage of Henry and Catherine being found originally void, as granted in contradiction to the law of God, the marriage would be void without any formal sentence of dissolution.

This opinion was stated with diffidence, and was received, not as a profound discovery, but as a natural though happy conclusion. Its propriety was so evident, that while some have denied the suggestion to be indicative of any extraordinary sagacity in Cranmer, others have denied to him the merit of being its author. The proposal of consulting the Universities on the question of the divorce has been attributed in the first instance to Wolsey<sup>a</sup>. But even if the fact be admitted, that the expedient had been advised by the Cardinal, yet as a member of the sacred college, and a devoted friend of the apostolic see, he would not have consulted the Universities with a view, by their authority, to bear down or to bias the decision of the Pope.

The truth of the popular relation, after all cavils, will stand unshaken, that the suggestion originated in Cranmer; that it was thought both by Fox and Gardiner to be worthy of communication to the King; that Gardiner wished to appropriate it to himself; but that Fox more ingenuously attributed it to Cranmer. If the suggestion had not possessed something of novelty and originality, it would not

<sup>a</sup> Fiddes's Life of Wolsey, p. 434. and Wordsw. Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 437, note.

have been received with such eagerness and gratification by Henry. Though the subject had for many years absorbed his thoughts, yet he declared himself strongly affected by the light which had then been thrown on it. Had he known it sooner, he might have been spared vast expense and great inquietude; and having expressed his approbation in a homely proverb<sup>b</sup>, he commanded that Cranmer should be summoned to the Court.

Cranmer was a man who rather avoided notice than sought preferment, and it was not till after more than one message that he was induced to appear before Henry. The favourable impression which he had made by report, was confirmed by a conference. He again repeated his opinion that the Universities of Europe should be consulted, and the advice was approved. But a previous task was imposed on him by his sovereign, of writing a treatise on the question of the divorce, and he was commanded particularly to direct his attention to this question: Whether the Bishop of Rome had authority to dispense with the law of God revealed in the Scriptures? During the time allotted for the performance of his labours, he was recommended by Henry to the patronage and hospitality of the father of Anne Boleyn, then newly created Earl of Wiltshire. When the treatise was finished and presented, its author offered to defend it in a disputation before the Bishop of Rome, if the King would send him thither. Henry handsomely expressed his approbation of the treatise, by replying, "Then I shall send you even to him on a sure errand."<sup>c</sup>

The suggestion of Cranmer was now carried into execution, and preparations were made for consulting the Universities at home and in foreign countries, together with the most learned individuals in theology and in the civil

<sup>b</sup> 'I perceive, quoth the King, that that man hath the sow by the right eare.'

<sup>c</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. ii. p. 191. and Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, vol. i. p. 6.

and canon law. It was thought advisable to begin with the Universities at home, and a royal letter was addressed to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, requiring their decision on the validity of a marriage with a brother's wife.

The decision of the University of Cambridge was the more expeditious in its return, but, although ultimately satisfactory, was not obtained without great opposition<sup>a</sup>. The doctrines of the Reformation had made considerable progress there, and of the reformers at Cambridge, Cranmer was at the head. His treatise on the divorce had the effect of identifying the question with the Reformation, and therefore all who were opposed to religious innovation ranged themselves in opposition to the divorce. An attempt was at first made to exclude any discussion of the question, for it was alleged that not a single man of eminence in the whole University could approach it with impartiality: all who approved the treatise of Cranmer had prejudged the question. After a long time consumed in this debate, it was at length proposed to refer the case to a select number, but this proposition was at first rejected; but on the succeeding day it was resolved, that the matter should be referred to twenty-nine persons, and that the University seal should be affixed to the determination of two-thirds of this number. When the question of the divorce was first moved, its lawfulness was decided in the negative; when put to the vote a second time, the assembly was divided in nearly equal proportions; but when proposed a third time, it was carried in the affirmative by the proportion required. The seal of the University was affixed to an instrument, declaring that the King's marriage was contrary to the law of God.

Though the determination of Oxford was slow in its return, yet it was more satisfactory in its result, as well as

<sup>a</sup> Letter from Gardiner and Fox to the King, in Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. xxxii.

in the mode of its procurement. Notwithstanding some objections adduced by Anthony Wood and Sanders, enemies of the Reformation, the proceedings appear to have been conducted with fairness. Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, was sent thither with a letter from the King, requiring the decision of the University, and when it had been read in Convocation, a unanimous resolution was passed to refer the matter to thirty-three Doctors and Bachelors in Divinity. The University seal was to be affixed to the determination of this committee, and accordingly an instrument was statutably authenticated, declaring that a marriage with a brother's wife was contrary to the law of God and of nature<sup>e</sup>.

The decisions of the English Universities were thus obtained by a royal mandate, but it was necessary to obtain the opinions of foreign Universities and learned individuals by another method. Richard Crooke, tutor of the Duke of Richmond, was sent into Italy, while other agents of Henry were sent into Germany and France. Crooke was indefatigable in fulfilling the office assigned to him, though he complained heavily of his poverty as a public inconvenience not less than a personal calamity. He travelled under no recognised character, but simply with a recommendation to John Cassali, the Venetian ambassador, in order to obtain admittance into the public libraries of Venice. There he consulted the Greek manuscripts in the library of Saint Mark, and examined the decrees of the General Councils. Having finished his researches at Venice, he visited Padua, Bologna, and other cities of note, and at last proceeded to Rome.

At Rome was a special English legation, of which the Earl of Wiltshire was at the head, and on which the principal attendants were Stokesley, Bishop of London, and Cranmer. The object of Cranmer was to fulfil his promise

<sup>e</sup> Lord Herbert (*Life of Hen. VIII.*) has preserved the record; see p. 352.

of defending his treatise before the Pope or the Emperor. The ambassadors, in the presence of the Pope, offered in behalf of the King of England to defend these two propositions : 1. That a marriage with a brother's wife was prohibited by the law of God ; 2. That the Bishop of Rome had no right to dispense with this prohibition. Many different days were appointed for a disputation on these two propositions, yet no disputation took place. Cranmer, having received from the Pope the compliment of being appointed penitentiary, or confessor, to the King of England, left Rome, and went into Germany.

Stokesley brought with him full instructions to Crooke for the prosecution of his enquiries. The opponents of the divorce rested their arguments chiefly on this point, that though the Levitical law prohibited a marriage with the wife of a brother, yet the law of Deuteronomy not only allowed but commanded such a marriage. It was there commanded, that when a man died without issue, his brother should marry the widow; and it was contended that the law of Deuteronomy was an abrogation of the law of Leviticus, or at least was a dispensation of it in any particular case. Crooke was directed to consult the Jewish rabbins on this apparent contradiction of the Mosaical law, and the contradiction was reconciled by the following solution : that the law of marrying the wife of a deceased brother, when he died without issue, was binding in the land of Judea only, and therefore was of temporary as well as local obligation. In Judea it was a useful regulation to preserve families, and maintain the succession to the inheritance of land as it had been divided among the tribes of Israel. But in all other parts of the world, and under the existing circumstances of the Jewish nation, the Levitical law was binding, and the prohibition against marrying a brother's wife was in force.

These inquiries Crooke professed to pursue abstractedly, and without reference to the question in agitation. At

first it was not known on whose agency he was employed, and he pursued his researches without molestation; but as soon as the fact was discovered, every effort was used to defeat his purposes. No one was more active against the King of England than Campeggio, who had ample means of misrepresenting the question, as well as of influencing public opinion. Not the indefatigable exertions of Crooke, but the force of truth alone, in spite of his impediments, could have procured so many concurrent testimonies in support of Henry's cause.

Of the Universities in Italy which decided in favour of the divorce, Bologna ought first to be mentioned, as being situated within the limits of the Ecclesiastical State. There the debate turned on this particular question, whether the law of Leviticus was obligatory on the Christian Church? The determination was affirmative, that this law is still in force, and binding universally both Christians and Infidels, being a part of the law of nature, as well as of the law of Moses and of God. Consequently, all marriages within the Levitical laws were unlawful, and the Pope had no authority to dispense with them.

The University of Padua, after some days of public disputation, determined that a marriage with a brother's wife was to be abominated by a Christian, as being prohibited by natural, human, and divine law. It was also determined, that the Pope could not, for any cause, dispense with such a marriage; since his authority extends not to any prohibition of the divine law, but is confined to those matters which are cognizable by human tribunals. The University of Ferrara had also determined against the validity of a marriage with a brother's wife, but through the intrigues of the imperial party, the instrument could not be obtained.

By the means of other agents employed by Henry, the decisions of the principal Universities in France were procured. The celebrated faculty of the Sorbonne, whose

decisions have been regarded by some persons as equally valid with the decrees of General Councils, entered into a discussion of the question with all possible solemnity. The College first met at the church of Saint Mathurin, where a mass of the Holy Ghost was celebrated, after which every individual member bound himself by an oath to study the matter with diligence, and to resolve it conscientiously. After being employed in diligent research during nearly a month, in examining the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Fathers, and in framing arguments, it was determined, by a majority of the faculty, that the King of England's marriage was unlawful, and that the Pope had no power to dispense with it. The faculty of the canon law at Paris, the University of Orleans, the faculty of divinity at Bruges, the faculties of civil and canon law at Angiers, and the whole University at Toulouse, came to a similar determination.

Great labour was employed, not only in consulting academical and other public bodies, but in ascertaining the opinions of learned individuals, and especially of those who favoured the Reformation. It has been said that this last measure was adopted by the advice of the Duke of Suffolk. Wise was the advice; for while the variety of these opinions evinced that they were formed without concert, and that the question was determined solely on its own merits, their preponderance was decidedly in favour of Henry.

Erasmus was supposed to be friendly to the divorce, but could not be induced to make a public declaration of his sentiments. He lived within the dominions of the Emperor, and to incur the resentment of the powerful by freedom of speech, was not one of his virtues. Oecolampadius delivered his decision, that the law of Leviticus was of universal obligation, and that the law of Deuteronomy was binding on the Jews only. Bucer thought differently: he maintained that the Levitical law did not bind uni-

versally, and that it could not be a moral law, because it was dispensed with by God Himself; and, therefore, to marry a brother's wife was not more sinful than to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath day, or to transgress any other ceremonial precept.

The opinion of Zuinglius was delivered at large. He began by proving, that neither the papal nor any other power could dispense with the law of God: he next showed that the Apostles had made no alteration in the Jewish law of marriage, but had left the ordinance as they found it; and concluded by proving, that the marriage of near degrees of affinity or consanguinity was regarded with abomination even by the heathen nations. His judgment was, that if the marriage were unlawful it should be immediately dissolved, but that the dissolution of the marriage should not have a retrospective effect, and render its issue illegitimate.

Calvin, who obtained great celebrity in early youth, and whose studies had been directed to the civil law, was not omitted in the list of reformers. He was clear in his judgment<sup>f</sup> that the marriage was null; and that by the law of Leviticus the King of England was justified in putting away Catherine. To the objection that the law of Leviticus against marrying a brother's wife was intended to refer to a living brother, he replied, with great acuteness, that such an interpretation was inadmissible, because all the prohibited degrees were forbidden in the same terms, and must be understood in the same sense. With respect to the law of Deuteronomy, which commanded the marriage of a brother's widow for the purpose of perpetuating a family, he thought that, according to the Hebrew idiom, the word "brother" might signify a near

<sup>f</sup> Calvini Epist. 384. p. 668. Neither the date, nor the name of the person to whom the Epistle was addressed, is preserved. Burnet's Hist. of the Reform. part i. b. ii. p. 188. Collier (Ecc. Hist. part ii. b. i. p. 155.) doubts the authenticity of this letter; but without sufficient reason.

kinsman. Such an interpretation would at once reconcile the two laws, and it was illustrated by the history of Ruth and Boaz.

Contrary accounts have been given concerning the sentiments of Melancthon. It has been said, without sufficient authority, that he advised the King to have two wives, and justified polygamy from the Old Testament; but it is rather probable that he declined to approve a second marriage, though the first might have been originally unlawful. Most of the Lutheran divines, with the exception of Osiander, who defended the divorce in a treatise, were unfavourable to a second marriage.

The decisions of the Universities and of other public bodies were collected principally by Crooke, and were transmitted to England through Stokesley. So many and so respectable testimonies could not be easily repelled; and therefore, to weaken their force, it was insinuated that they were obtained by corrupt methods. It has not been sufficiently considered, by those who have made the charge, that it involves the integrity of some of the best friends of the Church of Rome, and that, if it were true, the soundness of the opinions on an abstract question like that of the validity of Henry's marriage would not be impaired. That remuneration was generally offered, both to public bodies and individuals, and that it was often accepted, may be safely granted; but it was no more than a reasonable compensation for the time bestowed in research; it was precisely of that nature and amount which a professor of the law always receives as the fair and honourable reward of his labours.

Among the few who opposed the divorce by their writings, it is sufficient to mention no others than Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, Cardinal Cajetan, and Victoria. If their treatises be read without partiality, it must be seen how little they could urge in defence of the cause which they had espoused; and the conclusion will be inevitable,

that, if right feeling were on the side of Catherine, irrefragable argument was on the side of Henry. His advocates proved to a demonstration, that a marriage with a brother's wife was contrary to Scripture, to tradition, to the Canons of the Church, and to universal practice.

When a large number of these decisions had been collected and transmitted to Henry, he resolved to follow the advice originally given by Cranmer. He determined to publish to the world the result of his inquiries, and to renew his application to the Pope. That the application might have more weight, it emanated from some of the most distinguished characters in the realm, and it might be styled aptly the petition of the nobles, prelates, clergy, and commons of England. Among the subscribers of this petition was Wolsey, who then resided at Southwell, a palace belonging to the see of York, and who possessed great reputation and influence in the northern part of the kingdom<sup>f</sup>.

The purport of the address was, that the petitioners resorted to this measure in consequence of their near relation to the King of England. The King's cause, in the judgment of the learned men and of the Universities of England, France, and Italy, was now found to be just; that even in a common case such testimonies ought to have due weight, and still more when they regarded a King and a kingdom to which the holy See was so deeply indebted. But since neither the justice of the cause nor the King's most earnest desires had prevailed, they were obliged to complain of such conduct towards a Prince who, by his power and his pen, had supported the Catholic faith. If justice were still denied, the petitioners apprehended that the calamities attendant on civil war might

<sup>f</sup> It was signed by two Archbishops, four Bishops, two Dukes, two Marquesses, thirteen Earls, two Viscounts, twenty-three Barons, twenty-two Abbots, and eleven Commoners. See Lord Herbert's Life of Henry VIII. p. 331. and Cavendish's Life of Wolsey, p. 494.

ensue. These could be prevented only by the King's marriage with another wife, by whom he might expect issue. If the Pope refused to annul the present marriage, they must conclude that they were abandoned by him, and must be obliged to seek other remedies. Such an extremity they were anxious to prevent, and they would never resort to it until relief from him was hopeless.

To this address the Pope made a becoming reply. He first noticed the vehemence of their language, which he forgave, since he imputed it to their affection for their Prince. They had charged him with ingratitude and injustice, two heavy imputations. He acknowledged the great obligations which he owed to their King, which were far greater than had been expressed by themselves; obligations due both from the holy See and from himself personally. Thus much as to his gratitude; and so far had he been from denying justice to the King, that he had been charged with partiality towards him. At the King's request he had granted a commission to two legates, but from their decision the Queen had appealed. He had delayed the admission of the appeal as long as possible, but when he could no longer refuse, the Cardinals in consistory had unanimously allowed the appeal, and granted an avocation of the cause. Since the avocation, the King, so far from expediting the trial, had by his own ambassadors moved for its delay. In this posture the cause still remained, and he could not give sentence in an affair of such consequence when it was not even solicited. As to the determinations of Universities and learned men, he had seen none of them from the King's ambassadors. It was true that some had been conveyed to him indirectly, but they contained conclusions without any reasons. He had heard many forcible arguments on the other side, and therefore he could not decide with precipitation, till both sides were fully heard. He expressed his hearty wishes that the King might have issue; but this event depended

on God, and not on him. As to their threats of seeking other remedies, they were agreeable neither to wisdom nor religion; therefore he admonished them to abstain from such counsels, and reminded them that the obstinacy of the patient is not to be imputed to the physician.

Before this rescript of the Pope reached England, Henry issued a proclamation against all persons who purchased bulls, dispensations, or pardons from Rome, or elsewhere, contrary to his prerogatives and authority. The proclamation was founded on the statutes of *præmunire* and *provisors*, and was preparatory to the arrest of Wolsey for high treason.

From the time when this great prelate left Esher, he had retired by the King's command to his diocese of York, that being his highest English dignity and his greatest charge<sup>g</sup>. There, in comparative obscurity, removed from the intrigues of state and renouncing the projects of ambition, he had applied himself to fulfil the sacred duties of his function. With his diminished revenues, the munificence of his temper was not abated; and his benevolence, no longer debased by haughtiness and ostentation, gained universal esteem<sup>h</sup>. In the days of his political greatness he had forgotten his pastoral care, but now he delighted in performing its most laborious offices. It does not appear that he had ever visited his metropolitan city until he was banished from Court, and it is certain that he had never been installed in his cathedral. He was on the eve of performing that solemnity, "not for any triumph of glory," but in compliance with the ancient statutes of the Church of York, when he was arrested on a charge of treason by the Earl of Northumberland. Rather from a conviction that his innocence would not avert his impending ruin than from a consciousness of guilt, his fortitude

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

<sup>h</sup> This portion of the Cardinal's life has been ably vindicated from the censure of Fox by Wordsworth. Eccles. Biog. vol. i. note, p. 492.

entirely deserted him. With apparent cheerfulness he submitted to leave his castle at Cawood, and began his journey; but, before he had completed it, death removed him from the malice of his enemies. Having sent his assurances of fidelity to that master whom he had served with more devotion than his God, he recommended with his dying breath the suppression of Lutheran doctrines. He exemplified Bohemia at that time, and England under Richard the Second, as proofs that a spoliation of the Church is a prelude to rebellion, and the ruin of monarchical government<sup>i</sup>.

By the death of Wolsey, the strongest link which connected the Church of England with that of Rome was severed; and Henry was now free to prosecute his plans of ecclesiastical reform.

In the beginning of the next year the Parliament assembled, and concurrently with it the Convocation. The question of the divorce was fairly brought before the Parliament, in the following manner. The King first sent to the House of Lords the determinations of the Universities, and the treatises of other learned foreigners, in favour of his cause. When these documents had been read there, the Lord Chancellor More, with twelve other Lords, both spiritual and temporal, went down to the House of Commons. The documents were produced by the Chancellor for the inspection of the House, and twelve original decisions of different Universities, duly authenticated, were read aloud, Sir Brian Tuke rendering the Latin into English. The Lord Chancellor desired that the members would report in their different counties what they had heard and seen; and then it would be evinced that the King had not attempted his divorce merely of his own will and pleasure, as strangers affirmed, but only for the discharge of his conscience, and the security of the succession to the Crown.

<sup>i</sup> Cav. life of Wolsey, Wordsw. Eccl. Biog. p. 543.

The question was also brought before the Convocation, and there it was determined that the Bull of Julius the Second was invalid, and the marriage founded on it unlawful. But the determination of this assembly cannot be adduced as being of any weight; for the whole body of the Clergy was at this time visited by a penal infliction, which prevented freedom of deliberation.

It was an unworthy display of vindictive justice, to exact from Wolsey the penalties of a *præmunire*, for exercising his legatine power with the license of the King. It was an unparalleled act of oppression to involve the Clergy in a similar punishment for submitting to the authority of the Cardinal, whom it was not possible for them to oppose. Their consternation, then, cannot easily be described, when an indictment was brought into the Court of King's Bench against all the Clergy of England, for an infringement of the statute of *præmunire*.

Vain, they knew, would have been the plea of ignorance of the statute; for of the law no one can be presumed to be ignorant, and ignorance cannot be pleaded in justification of any offence. Equally vain would have been the plea that the King himself had permitted the violation of the law; or, that the disobedience of the Clergy to the legatine authority of the Cardinal would have involved them in ruin; or, that their obedience was beneficial to the King, and detrimental to themselves alone. To either or all of these pleas they knew that an answer was ready; that the statute was still in force, though negligently executed; that its violation by the Clergy was a matter of public notoriety; and that by its violation they had put themselves out of the King's protection<sup>k</sup>. Yet they were informed that, although they had subjected themselves to

<sup>k</sup> "Namque illa rigida provisionum jura, non modo eos puniunt qui Romanas legationes sine regis licentiâ suscipiunt, sed qui hujusmodi authoritati parent, minui majestas regia ab utrisque pariter existimatur." Ant. Brit. Eccles. in Warhamo, p. 486.

a confiscation of their entire property, they might still receive the pardon of the Crown, on a reasonable composition, together with a full submission to the royal authority in ecclesiastical matters.

A submission was therefore prepared by the Convocation of the province of Canterbury. In this instrument the King was styled the Protector and Supreme Head of the Church of England. An objection was made to the title, and its propriety occasioned a debate; but Cromwell, who had succeeded Wolsey in the administration of public affairs, came to the House, and gained from it a full acknowledgment of the King's supremacy. The measure passed in silent discontent, but without active opposition; for Warham, having put the question, said, "that silence was to be taken for consent," and a member present answered, "Then we are all silent." It appears that to the original submission a clause was added, acknowledging the King to be the Head of the Church, as far as is agreeable to the law of Christ; and with this clause the instrument received the assent of nine Bishops, sixty-two Abbots and Priors in the Upper House, together with a majority of the Lower House. A petition was subjoined, that the King would accept a fixed fine, £100,000, in lieu of all penalties which the Clergy had incurred by a breach of the statute of *provisors*.

The Clergy of the province of York urged the same objections to the title of the petition, and were bold enough to transmit their reasons for declining to acknowledge the King Supreme Head of the Church. But a severe reprimand from the King soon reduced them to obedience: they offered a similar petition to the province of Canterbury, and voted a sum by way of fine proportionably equal, viz. £18,840.

The royal pardon was then granted to the offending Clergy; but when, according to custom, it was brought into the House of Commons to receive its assent, great

dissatisfaction arose, because that body was not included in it. The Commons as well as the Clergy had offended against the statute of *provisors*, and consequently were liable to similar penalties. They naturally inferred that the same hard measure might hereafter be dealt out to themselves, and that they might be obliged to redeem their transgression of the statute by a mulct equally grievous. To avert such a calamity, they sent some of their members with their Speaker, representing their extreme sorrow at finding themselves excluded from the pardon granted to the King's spiritual subjects, and praying to be comprehended within it. On this representation the pardon was granted gratuitously, but not graciously. The King answered, that the Commons ought neither to restrain nor to force his clemency, and that it was free to him either to execute or to mitigate the severity of the law. He would be well advised before he granted their pardon, that it might not seem to be granted by compulsion. The act of grace was therefore delayed a sufficient time, to show that it was not elicited by the petition, but that it was a spontaneous act of royal benevolence. It was conceded, that all the temporal subjects of the realm should be pardoned their transgression of the statute of *provisors*; and the boon was received with a suitable acknowledgment, that there was a just mixture of majesty and clemency in the King's proceedings.

This important and easy triumph of Henry over the Parliament and the Convocation could not fail to excite alarm in the mind of the Pope. He saw too late that England was ready to renounce her obedience to the Apostolic See; and, from what had been already done with respect to the statute of *provisors*, he concluded that more would be attempted in prejudice of the papal jurisdiction. His alliance with the Emperor was at an end, and he had contracted his niece in marriage with the Duke of Orleans. At this juncture he was strongly in-

clined to grant the divorce; but the imperial interest in the College of Cardinals was predominant, and the conclave was prepared to resist such a proposition. He was therefore compelled to wait the issue, and to regulate his conduct by future contingencies.

Another session of the English Parliament was sufficient to convince the Pope that his fears and surmises were just. However the King and his Parliament 1532 might differ on some other points of policy, they cordially cooperated in repressing the authority of the See of Rome. One statute<sup>1</sup> passed in this session provided against citing any person out of the diocese wherein he resided, except in cases of prerogative administration in the Archbishop's court, or in cases of heresy. In another<sup>m</sup>, the foundation of a breach was laid between England and Rome, by restraining the payment of first-fruits and annates. The statute stated, that these payments were not sanctioned by any law, and that the Court of Rome had no other method of enforcing them than by withholding its Bulls; that they were originally paid to defend Christendom against infidels, but were now claimed as a debt, against all right and conscience; that these payments, from the second year of King Henry the Seventh to that time, had amounted to eight hundred thousand ducats; and that large additional sums were likely soon to be carried out of the kingdom, in consequence of the great age of several of the Prelates, and the probability of a speedy vacancy in their sees. On these accounts it was enacted, that all payments of first-fruits and annates to the Court of Rome should be abolished, and for ever restrained, under the penalty of confiscation of goods and the profits of the benefice. In case the Court of Rome should refuse or withhold its Bulls and other instruments necessary for the consecration of any Bishop, the Bishop elect should nevertheless receive

<sup>1</sup> 23 Hen. VIII. c. 9.

<sup>m</sup> 23 Hen. VIII. c. 20. Lord Herbert's Life of Hen. VIII. p. 358.

consecration from the Archbishop of the province, and any elected Archbishop should be consecrated by four Bishops appointed by royal commission; and such Archbishop or Bishop should enjoy all rights belonging to his respective see in the most ample manner. Yet that the Pope might have no just cause of complaint, the Prelates presented to their Bishoprics were allowed to pay five pounds in every hundred of the clear profits of their Bishoprics.

It was evident from the terms in which these statutes were expressed, that Henry did not intend his rupture with the Pope to be either immediate or total. They were designed as a temperate measure, to bring the wavering Clement to an accommodation. This last statute against first-fruits did not therefore at the time of its enactment receive the royal assent, but was to be a provisional regulation till the King had compounded the claim with the Pope, or prevailed on the Pope altogether to renounce it. In the mean time the whole conduct of the transaction was left to the King, who was empowered to declare, within a certain period, whether the statute should be in force or not, and it was not till several months after it had passed the Parliament that it was ratified by letters patent.

Remonstrances were again urged by Henry for the settlement of his divorce, and were conveyed in language less respectful to the Pope than formerly. The King imputed the mistakes of the holy father to the rashness and ignorance of the counsellors of the consistorial court, but for these the Pontiff was culpably responsible: he had not demeaned himself as became the Vicar of Jesus Christ, but had acted with inconstancy and deceit. When the King's cause was first propounded, the Pope had granted a commission, with a promise not to recal it, but to confirm the sentence which the legates might decree. If this commission were rightly granted, to revoke it was a flagrant act of injustice: if it were rightly revoked, to grant it

originally was not less unjust. The King perceived that the Apostolic See was destitute of that learning which it ought to possess; for the Pope had on one occasion professed his ignorance of the canon law. Many Universities in France, England, and even in Italy, had decided that his marriage was illegal, and that the papal Bull was a nullity. No Prince had ever shown greater deference to the See of Rome than himself. He was sorry even now to write in such harsh language, but forbearance was impossible. He added, that he did not intend to impugn the papal authority any farther, unless he were compelled to do it; for all which he had already done was to reduce that authority within its ancient limits. Therefore he earnestly desired the holy father to conform himself to the opinions of so many learned men, and to fulfil his duty<sup>n</sup>.

This spirited remonstrance produced no other effect than that of calling forth from the Pope a citation, commanding the King of England to appear at Rome, either in person or by proxy, to answer the Queen's appeal. The citation was met, on the part of Henry, by sending Sir Edward Karne to Rome as his excusator, that is, to plead his excuse for not obeying the mandate. In this capacity Karne was instructed, first, to insist on the excusatory pleas that might be found in the canon law; and these not availing, secondly, to insist on the prerogatives of the English Crown. Karne was accompanied on this embassy by Boner, whose bold and impetuous temper was at this early period of his life sufficiently conspicuous.

On the arrival of Karne and Boner at Rome, they found that the imperial party prevailed in the Conclave. The moderate and impartial part foresaw the separation of England from the holy See, and that the statute lately

<sup>n</sup> Lord Herbert's Life of Hen. VIII. p. 368. and Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. xlvi.

passed in the English Parliament against first-fruits was a demonstration of the union between the King and his people. The ambassadors informed the Pope, in answer to his expostulation concerning this statute, that its ratification depended entirely on the King, and that the King, unless provoked, had no intention of putting it in execution.

As to the primary object of the embassy, no progress was made, after a delay of several months. The Cardinal of Ravenna was corruptly gained over to the cause of Henry, and Providellus, the most able canonist in Italy, was openly retained in his service; yet with these aids the affair was not expedited. After several sessions had been consumed in fruitless altercation, it was formally announced in the consistory, that the King's excusatory plea should neither be allowed nor rejected, but that the King should be required to send his proxy before the ensuing winter. Boner, however, received a private intimation from the Cardinals favourable to Henry, that the excusatory plea could not be admitted, for the matter could be judged only by the Pope in his own consistory. At the same time assurances were given, that the King had no cause to fear the partiality of the Pope towards the Emperor, from whom he was completely alienated.

A short prorogation of his Parliament supplied Henry with leisure to arrange his future attacks against the see of Rome. When that body reassembled, the King sent to the House of Commons by their Speaker, submitting to their consideration, that the Prelates of the realm, who were the subjects of the King, yielded to him only a divided allegiance. At their consecration they took an oath of obedience to the Pope, in direct contradiction to their oath of obedience to the King. This contradiction was referred to the Commons, who were required to make such an order in the matter, "that the King might not be deluded." The two oaths were read in the House, and their contradiction was so evident, that it would soon have called

forth censure and correction. But the plague, which then raged in the metropolis, prevented any further proceeding, and in consequence of this calamity the Parliament was suddenly prorogued.

Soon after the session had closed, an event happened which excited a strong sensation in the minds of the people, and gave rise to contradictory surmises. This event was the resignation of Sir Thomas More. He pleaded, and pleaded truly, infirmity of body for his retirement, and earnestly solicited that he might be discharged from his high office, and be allowed to pass the remaining part of his life in spiritual exercises. But it was generally believed, that his real motive for withdrawing into privacy was dissatisfaction at the King's proceedings. As a lawyer he had concurred in putting in use the statute against *provisors*, though, as a man of right feeling, he could not but condemn its harsh and inequitable application. He would have restrained the illegal jurisdiction exercised by the Popes, and therefore had assented to the statute against first-fruits. But when he perceived that a complete subversion of the papal authority was contemplated, he declined to take any share in the public counsels. His resignation was received by Henry with a kindness and regret equally sincere, and he was dismissed with this flattering testimony of regard: "Sir Thomas, if there be any thing that shall concern your honour, or pertain to your profit, you shall always find us your good and gracious lord, and so make your account of us<sup>o</sup>."

An event of greater importance to the interests of the Church at this crisis than the resignation of More occurred in the death of Warham. This importance was not derived from the influential character of Warham, but from the weight which his successor must necessarily possess in determining the future condition of the Church of England, and whether it was to be reunited to, or finally separated

<sup>o</sup> Life of Sir Thomas More, Words. Eccl. Biog. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 172.

from, the Romish See. Throughout all the proceedings of Henry, Warham had shown a sullen acquiescence, and in some of them had openly concurred, by promoting them in Parliament and Convocation. But in the last year of his life, he made a secret protestation, before three public notaries and four other witnesses, of which the substance was, that whatever statutes had passed, or were to pass, in the Parliament then sitting, to the prejudice of the Pope or the Apostolic See, or in derogation or diminution of the rights of his see of Canterbury, he did not consent to them, but thereby, and by virtue of his protestation, disowned and dissented from them<sup>p</sup>.

The fact is here simply mentioned, without drawing from it a single harsh inference. Of all infirmities, the timid reservations, the unsteady resolves, or the unexecuted purposes, of extreme age, are least obnoxious to human censure. They are to be remitted to THAT BEING whose judgment they must so shortly await, to THAT BEING “WHO KNOWETH OUR FRAME.”

## CHAPTER IV.

Promotion of Cranmer to the Primacy.—Previous Marriage of Henry with Anne Boleyn.—Statute against Appeals.—Convocation decides against the validity of Catherine's Marriage.—Cranmer pronounces the Sentence of Divorce, and confirms the Marriage of Anne Boleyn.—Proceedings at Rome.—Statutes passed in Parliament against the Papal Authority.—Acts confirming the King's Supremacy, and regulating the Succession.—Execution of Fisher and More.

By the death of Warham, the arduous duty was imposed on Henry of selecting a person to fill the highest dignity in the English Church, under circumstances the most critical. It is certain that the selection was his own

<sup>p</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. ii. no. 22.

deliberate, if not unbiassed, act; for advice would probably have been ill received by him, and direct interference would have been repelled with indignation. Justice, as well to himself as to the object of his choice, requires that his motives should be vindicated from the insinuation commonly imputed, that the qualifications which he sought in the future Archbishop were base assentation and unprincipled compliance.

To accompany him in his projects of renouncing the Papal supremacy, or of promoting his divorce, could not have been contemplated as the only prerequisites. On the first point he had not finally resolved; but the probable inclination of his mind was to accommodate his differences with the Pontiff, and to bring his kingdoms to a state of limited subjection to the See of Rome. On the second point he was doubtless inflexible; but, far from finding an impediment to his wishes among the English prelates and divines, the majority entirely agreed with him, and had already afforded a zealous co-operation. If the Primacy had been conferred either as a reward for past exertions or as a bribe for future services in this affair, he might have been embarrassed in his choice. He had already experienced, and might have safely trusted, the diligence of Stokesley, the dexterity of Gardiner, and the forwardness of Boner. But, by fixing on Cranmer, he proved that he was not influenced by sinister considerations; and, at the same time, gave a decisive testimony to the merit of that distinguished individual.

Although the reputation of Cranmer was great as an academician, yet as an ecclesiastic he was almost unknown. His appointments in the Church were inconsiderable, and these were not of long possession<sup>a</sup>. Since the time that

<sup>a</sup> Cranmer, before his promotion to the see of Canterbury, was Archdeacon of Taunton, and the King's Penitentiary, to which last office he had been appointed by the Pope. He had also a benefice conferred on him by the King. Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b.i.c.4.p.20.

he had quitted the embassy of the Earl of Wiltshire at Rome, he had resided in Germany. There he had cultivated the friendship of the most eminent Lutheran Reformers, and there he received the intimation of the high dignity for which he had been so unexpectedly designated.

That Cranmer unwillingly accepted the proffered office may be allowed even by those who have formed the lowest estimate of his character. A man of less modesty, or rather of higher ambition, than himself, might have declined a situation of such responsibility and danger. He obeyed the summons to return to England, but obeyed it slowly, and still lingered in Germany. This reluctance only tended to confirm Henry in his resolution; and Cranmer, after many entreaties to be exempted from so heavy a burden, at length yielded to the royal will.

A statute had already been enacted against procuring bulls and dispensations from Rome; but on this occasion the King availed himself of the power vested in him, of suspending its execution. The first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury was consecrated by the authority of a Papal mandate. It may be assumed that Clement, from his former reminiscences of Cranmer, was averse from the appointment; but he had no wish to provoke the anger of Henry, or to precipitate a rupture with England. Unwillingly therefore he consented to the promotion, and transmitted to Henry the last Bulls which were received in England during his reign.

Some of these instruments were directed to the Archbishop elect, and these Cranmer delivered to the King<sup>r</sup>. Among them was a mandate for his consecration, on condition of his taking the oath prescribed by the pontifical. The dislike of this oath was probably one of the motives which at first induced him to refuse the Primacy, and he

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. b. i. c. 4. p. 27.

retained his scruples of taking it as the time of his consecration approached. He unreservedly declared, that many parts of the canon law ought to be reformed, and that the obligation imposed by this oath would prevent him from engaging in such a reformation. When this objection was communicated to some of the canonists and casuists, they devised an expedient which agreed better with their own maxims than with the sincerity of Cranmer<sup>s</sup>, but which he was persuaded to adopt. Before he took the prescribed oath, he made a formal protestation, that he did not intend thereby to restrain himself from any measure to which he was bound by his duty, either to God, or to the King, or to the country: and that he renounced every part of the oath that was contrary to either of these obligations. This protestation he made in the chapel of Saint Stephen, at Westminster, before his consecration, and he repeated it when the consecration was performed<sup>t</sup>, immediately before he took the oath of obedience to the Pope.

Previously to the consecration of Cranmer, Henry had been privately married to Anne Boleyn<sup>u</sup>. The marriage ceremony was performed by Rowland Lee, afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, in the presence of the Duke of Norfolk, and the nearest relatives of the new Queen. Cranmer, so far from officiating at the solemnity, was not only absent, but was for some time afterwards ignorant that the event had taken place. Henry, having collected the decisions of so many public bodies and learned men in his favour, thought it superfluous to wait longer for any sentence, declaring the invalidity of his marriage with Catherine, but acted on the presumption of its original nullity.

<sup>s</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. ii. p. 261.

<sup>t</sup> Cranmer was consecrated by the Bishops of Lincoln, Exeter, and Saint Asaph. Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. i. c. 4. p. 28.

<sup>u</sup> The 25th of January, 1533, according to Stowe; and Cranmer confirms Stowe, in a letter to Hawkins, the ambassador to the Emperor.

In a Session of Parliament, assembled before Cranmer had any voice in its deliberations, the breach with the Pope was widened by a Statute against all appeals to the See of Rome\*. The preamble of the Act stated, that the Crown of England was imperial, and that the nation was a complete body within itself, having full power to give justice in all cases, spiritual as well as temporal. Among the English spirituality, there had been at all times, and there were then, men of sufficient integrity to declare and determine all controversies arising within the kingdom. Successive Kings, as Edward the First and Third, Richard the Second, and Henry the Fourth, by severe laws, had preserved the liberties of the realm, both spiritual and temporal, from the annoyance of the See of Rome, and other foreign potentates; but these Statutes had not sufficiently provided against appeals in causes of matrimony and divorce. In such causes, not only the King and his subjects were compelled to incur great charges, but justice was inconveniently delayed. The distance of Rome was such, that evidences and witnesses could not, without great trouble, be conveyed thither. For these reasons it was enacted, that all such causes, whether they related to the King or to any of his subjects, were to be determined within the kingdom, in the several courts to which they belonged, and the sentences of these courts were to be fully executed by all subordinate functionaries. Appeals were to proceed in the following gradations: from the Archdeacon or his Official to the Bishop of the diocese or his Commissary; from the Bishop of the diocese to the Archbishop of the province, or the Dean of the Court of Arches, where the final determination was to be made without further process. But in any cause that regarded the King, or his heirs and successors, an appeal should

\* Stat. 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12.

lie to the Upper House of Convocation, where it should be determined finally, never again to be called in question.

The enactment of this Statute was not only another step towards the liberation of the Church of England from foreign control, but it was a demonstration of the sense of the Parliament on the question of the King's divorce. It had a farther connexion with the proceedings of the Convocation on this point, and was passed to give validity to the decision of that assembly.

During the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, the prior and convent of the metropolitan Church in that city were the legal guardians of the spiritualities, and in that capacity they deputed the Bishop of Saint Asaph to preside in the Convocation. While that Prelate represented the Archbishop, the two Houses were employed in considering the determinations of the foreign Universities on the validity of the marriage, and also the probability of its consummation.

When Cranmer had received his investiture, he immediately assumed the presidency of the Convocation<sup>y</sup>; and two questions were formally proposed for its deliberation. The first<sup>z</sup> was on the abstract proposition, "Whether it was against the law of God, and indispensable by the Pope, for a man to marry his brother's wife, he being dead without issue, but having consummated the marriage?" The second was on the particular fact, "Whether Prince Arthur had consummated his marriage with the Queen?"

The first question, when put to the vote of the Lower House, fell under the determination of the divines only, and they composed a very small proportion of that body. Of these, fourteen voted for the affirmative, seven for the

<sup>y</sup> Parker, *de Antiq. Brit. Eccl. vitâ Cranmer.* p. 490.

<sup>z</sup> The first question is awkwardly expressed in the original minutes of the Convocation, but has been shaped by Burnet in the form in which it stands in the text. Burnet's *Hist. Ref.* vol. i. b. ii. p. 261.

negative, one was doubtful, and one thought the prohibition moral, but yet dispensable by the Pope. In the Upper House, the debates were long; Stokesley, Bishop of London, arguing for the affirmative, and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, for the negative. But the majority for the affirmative was so large, that the minority, after a protracted discussion, retired, leaving the House to an unanimous decision.

The second question, as it fell under the cognizance of the canonists, was determined by the prelates and divines of that faculty. All the canonists of the Lower House, with the exception of five or six, were for the affirmative, and the Upper House agreed in the determination, the Bishop of Bath and Wells being the only dissentient.

These two questions were afterwards transmitted to the Convocation of the province of York. There were present twenty-seven divines, who held the proxies of twenty-four absentees; and all, with the exception of two, voted for the affirmative of the first question. There were also present forty-four canonists, who held the proxies of five or six absentees; and, with the exception of two, they determined the second question in the affirmative.

The solemn decision of the English Church, in its representative capacity, having been obtained, nothing remained but the formality of a judicial sentence declaratory of that decision. There was some delay in arranging the final process, and before it commenced, an attempt was made to induce Catherine to acquiesce in the opinions of so many Universities and learned men, and to lay aside the dignity of Queen.

The conduct of Catherine was consistent and dignified: she rejected all terms of accommodation, and adhered to her appeal to the Pope. When it was found that every mode of application was fruitless, then it was determined to pronounce a formal sentence of divorce. The process was completed by the following steps. Cranmer first

wrote to the King <sup>a</sup>, stating that the world had been long scandalized at his pretended marriage, and that as Metropolitan it was incumbent on him to see the cause tried and determined: therefore he prayed a royal licence to proceed. The licence being obtained, both the King and Queen were cited to appear before the Archbishop. Dunstable, in Bedfordshire, was the place chosen for the court to hold its sessions, on account of its vicinity to Ampthill, the residence of Catherine, and that she might not plead ignorance of the process about to be concluded. The Bishop of Lincoln sat as Assessor to the Archbishop, and Gardiner, now promoted to the see of Winchester, retained his place as leader of the King's counsel. The Bishops of London, and of Bath and Wells, with many other divines and canonists, were present, either to assist by their advice, or to give countenance to the proceedings <sup>b</sup>.

At the first session the King appeared by proxy to the citation, but the Queen appeared not. On account of her non-appearance she was pronounced contumacious, and a second citation was issued, and afterwards a third. When she had refused to appear at these different citations, her contumacy was finally declared and recorded. On the succeeding sessions, the evidences already brought before the legates, concerning the consummation of the former marriage with Prince Arthur, were read; then the determinations of the Universities, with the opinions of eminent divines and canonists, were produced; and lastly, the recent and solemn judgments of the Convocations of Canterbury and York were recited. Many sessions were thus

<sup>a</sup> Lingard calls this process a hypocritical farce; but Cranmer in his letter stated nothing more than Campeggio said in court, that it was a scandal for the King to live longer in a state of incest. Lingard's Hist. Eng. vol. vi. c. 3. p. 256.

<sup>b</sup> Cranmer, in a letter to Archdeacon Hawkyns, gives an account of the final sentence of divorce. Rem. of T. Cranmer, D.D. by the Rev. H. Jenkyns, M.A. Oxford, 1833. v. i. p. 27.

employed, and, at the close of the evidence, sentence was pronounced with the advice of all present. The marriage between Henry and Catherine was adjudged to have been originally null, and they were declared to be divorced and separated from the matrimonial bond. In the sentence the Archbishop was called by his ancient title, Legate of the Apostolic See, as well as Primate of all England.

Sentence of divorce being thus passed, Cranmer with the rest of the court returned to London, and five days afterwards, by another sentence, he confirmed the marriage of the King with Anne Boleyn, in general terms, and without assigning the reasons on which his sentence was founded <sup>c</sup>.

When this important affair, which had been so long and fiercely agitated, was brought to a termination, it was variously commented on and censured. Even those who approved the divorce, condemned the conduct of Henry in marrying Anne Boleyn before his first marriage was formally dissolved. Cranmer incurred no small share of obloquy, although he was nothing more than the organ of the Convocation, and pronounced a sentence which that assembly had ratified. It is impossible to deny that public opinion was biassed by the connexion which subsisted between the divorce and the Reformation. The reformers had always looked forward with hope to the King's disunion from Catherine, since they expected to find protection from a new Queen. They had once expected it from the Duchess d'Alençon: they now expected it from Anne Boleyn.

The public acknowledgment of Anne as the royal consort preceded the sentence of divorce, and her coronation immediately followed it. Henry notified the event to the different Courts of Europe by his ambassadors, and at the same time offered reasons in its justification. The Emperor received the intelligence with coldness, and answered

<sup>c</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. xlviij.

that he should deliberate on the course which it was expedient for him to pursue. The King of France expressed the most friendly sentiments towards Henry, yet joined with that deference towards the Pope which the projected alliance between their families tended to excite.

When the event was first known at Rome, the Cardinals of the imperial party earnestly recommended that the most prompt and vigorous measures should be adopted : they pressed the Pope to give a definitive sentence, and to proceed to execute spiritual censures against the King of England. But moderate counsels at this crisis prevailed. It was resolved merely to nullify the process and sentence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which, in the terms of the canon law, were styled *attentates*, or attempts, on the authority of the Pope. A declaration was therefore issued, that whatever had been attempted in England concerning the suit of divorce was of no validity, and that the King by such attempts was liable to excommunication, unless within a reasonable time he restored matters to their former state. If he refused compliance, spiritual censures were to be applied, and the Archbishop of Canterbury was threatened with a canonical process for his share in the transaction.

A personal interview between Clement and Francis took place soon afterwards, for the purpose of completing the projected treaty of marriage between their families. Marseilles was the place of their meeting ; and Francis, mindful of his friendly professions towards Henry, offered his mediation in accommodating the differences between England and the See of Rome. Gardiner and Sir Edward Brian were sent by Henry to Marseilles as ambassadors to Francis, with a design of cooperating in an amicable adjustment with the Pope. Boner was afterwards joined in the embassy, but for a purpose less conciliatory : he was instructed to deliver an appeal from the late sentence of the holy See to the next General Council lawfully called ;

and Cranmer, being threatened with a process, delivered a similar appeal, to be communicated by Gardiner <sup>a</sup>.

The object of Boner's embassy, and his offensive manner of executing it, were not in accordance with the temper of Francis. This monarch is said to have obtained a promise from the Pope that, if the King of England would submit himself to the judgment of the Apostolic See, a decision should be given according to his wishes; and it was agreed between Francis and Clement, that the Cardinals of the imperial party should be excluded from any voice in this matter, since they must necessarily be prejudiced and incompetent judges.

When the interview between Francis and Clement had terminated, and the former had returned to Paris, Bellay, Bishop of that diocese, was sent to England; and this Prelate is said to have prevailed with Henry to submit the whole affair to the consistory at Rome on the terms agreed at Marseilles. Such a promise must have been given by Henry privately, for his despatches to his ambassadors breathed a different spirit. They were instructed to say, that their sovereign could not contentedly permit his cause to be tried out of the realm. Such a permission would violate his prerogatives and the laws, which by his oath at his coronation he was bound to maintain. The measure could not be adopted without the concurrence of his Parliament, and that concurrence he did not expect. But if the Pope would refer the determination of the matter to the Church of England, and ratify the sentence which that Church had already given, he would not only gain the obedience of the English King and people, but would secure the religious peace of all Christendom.

To secure a continuance of the friendly mediation of France, the Duke of Norfolk addressed Montmorenci. He expressed a high satisfaction that the Bishop of Paris had proceeded from England to Rome, and a hope

<sup>a</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. ii. no. 24.

that the negociation might be brought to a happy conclusion. If the Pope still persisted in his resolution of favouring the Emperor, a complete subversion of his authority in England would be the unavoidable result. A belief had gained ground that the Pope had no more authority out of Rome than any other Bishop had out of his diocese, and that the usurpations of the Romish See arose from the connivance of weak princes. Of this the English prelates and divines were so confident, and supported their opinion by such weighty arguments, as to convince himself and other noblemen, as well as the great body of the people. If the King yielded to the popular feeling, the ensuing Parliament would entirely withdraw the kingdom from its obedience to the Pope, and other states might be induced to follow the example<sup>e</sup>.

It has been stated, that Henry, on the representations of the Bishop of Paris, consented to suspend the total separation of England from the Romish See, if the Pope would consent to suspend the execution of the consistorial sentence against the King<sup>f</sup>. It is certain, however, that Bellay undertook a journey to Rome in a severe winter with a view of restoring harmony between the contending parties, and of preventing a schism in the Church. The propositions of Francis, as they were acquiesced in by Henry, were submitted by Bellay to the consistory, and were deemed reasonable. A courier was therefore sent to England, to receive the written submission of the King, and the messenger was enjoined to return within a limited time.

The courier having failed to present himself at Rome within the time appointed, the Cardinals of the imperial party urged the Pope to proceed to a definitive sentence. On the other hand, the Bishop of Paris implored both the

<sup>e</sup> From Le Grand, quoted by Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. ii. p. 168.

<sup>f</sup> Mem. du Bellay, brother to the Bishop of Paris; Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. ii. p. 170.

Pope and Cardinals to delay the sentence till the expiration of six days. He forcibly represented that the messenger might have been unavoidably detained, and that as the King of England had been a patient suitor in the consistorial court during six years, a delay of six days was not too great an indulgence. This remonstrance was delivered by Bellay to a full consistory, and its justice was acknowledged by many of the Cardinals; but the imperial party prevailed over the moderate portion of the consistory, and over the timid and vacillating Pope. The definitive sentence was carried through with an unusual and indecent haste, and without the accustomed formalities. With a precipitation fatal to the See of Rome, a Bull was issued, rescinding the sentence of divorce pronounced by the Archbishop of Canterbury, confirming the marriage of Henry with Catherine, and pronouncing him excommunicated, if within a limited time he did not abandon Anne Boleyn, and return to the wife whom he had unjustly deserted. Two days after the publication of the definitive sentence, the messenger from England arrived, bringing with him the formal submission of Henry, and then many of the Cardinals requested the Pope to reconsider the matter in a consistory, and to retract the definitive sentence. The matter was again debated, but in the result the definitive sentence was confirmed, and the Emperor was entrusted with its execution.

Whether this submission of Henry was even proffered, or whether, if proffered, it was sincere, is doubtful: it is still more doubtful whether, despotic as he was, he could have prevailed with his Parliament to retrace its steps, and to have opposed the current of public opinion. Public discussions on the extent of the papal power were at this time frequent: the subject had been debated both in Parliament and Convocation, and many treatises had been circulated impugning the See of Rome. The whole Prelacy, with the exception of Fisher, and all the leading

divines, were united in opposing the papal supremacy. Gardiner and Boner were thus conjointly employed in editing a didactic treatise on true obedience<sup>s</sup>; Stokesley and Tonstal performed the same service in a controversial epistle to Reginald Pole. But a more efficacious mode of making an impression on the popular mind, in an age when there were few readers, was adopted with success: during the session of the ensuing Parliament, a Bishop preached on every Sunday at Saint Paul's Cross, that the Pope had no authority in England.

It was at the precise time when the submission of Henry was in its progress towards Rome that the Parliament was convened, which did not separate till the emancipation of England from papal tyranny was completed. While Bellay was negotiating in the consistory, a Bill originated in the House of Commons for discharging the subject from all dependence on the See of Rome<sup>h</sup>, and it appears to have passed both Houses with little opposition. Some provisions were added by the Lords, to which the Commons afterwards agreed, and the Bill finally received the royal assent. The Bill commenced with a heavy complaint of the intolerable exactions of *Peter-pence*, *Provisions*, and *Bulls*, which were founded on no law, but only on an authority usurped by the Popes of granting dispensations. But since the King had been already acknowledged the Supreme Head of the Church

<sup>s</sup> The treatise of Gardiner, 'De Verâ Obedientiâ,' was furnished with a Preface by Boner, at that time Archdeacon of Leicester. Gardiner has the following passage on the claim of the Popes to the primacy in the Christian Church on the authority of Saint Peter: "In scripturis de primatu Petri nulla facta est mentio, et Eusebius in ecclesiastica historiâ refert Clementem in sexto dispositionum libro asseruisse, Petrum, Johannem, et Jacobum, post assumptionem Salvatoris, quamvis ab ipso fuerint omnibus penè prælati, non sibi tamen eos primatûs gloriam vindicasse, sed Jacobum qui justus appellabatur, apostolorum Episcopum esse statutum." Fascic. Rer. Brown. tom. ii. p. 814.

<sup>h</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 21.

of England, by the Prelates and Clergy in their Convocations, therefore it was enacted, that all payments made to the apostolic chamber, and all papal *Provisions, Bulls, and Dispensations*, should thenceforth cease. In future, all dispensations, or licences, for things not contrary to the law of God, or to the law of the land, were to be granted within the realm by the two Archbishops within their respective provinces, but they might not presume to grant any dispensation contrary to the law of God, and only in cases when they were accustomed to grant it. They were not empowered to grant a dispensation for any new matter until the King and his council had examined whether such matter were dispensable or not, and all dispensations of a certain value (viz. above £4) were to be confirmed under the Great Seal.

Another Statute of great importance to the Church was passed at this time, founded on the submission of the Clergy<sup>i</sup>; not on a recent submission, but on that offered and accepted two years before, when the whole body of the Clergy had incurred the penalties of a breach of “the statute of *præmunire*<sup>k</sup>.” The submission, as it was recited in the Act, consisted of two parts, a promise and a petition. In the first part, the Clergy having acknowledged that all Convocations had been, and ought to be, assembled by the King’s writ, gave a promise, *in verbo sacerdotii*, not to promulge or put in ure any new Canons, Constitutions, and Ordinances, provincial or synodal, without the royal assent and authority. The second part consisted of a petition, stating, that whereas many religious Canons and Constitutions then in force were bound to be onerous both to the King and his subjects, therefore they prayed that the whole body of the Canon law might be revised. They proposed that its examination might be submitted to thirty-two persons “of the King’s subjects,” of whom the

<sup>i</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19.

<sup>k</sup> Atterbury’s Rights, Powers, &c. of an English Convoc. p. 82.

half was to be chosen from the temporality of the Upper and Lower House of Parliament, and the other half was to consist of the Clergy of the realm. This committee, chosen from the Parliament and Convocation, it was prayed might be empowered with the royal assent to determine what part of the Canon law ought to be abrogated, and what part should continue in force.

This promise and petition was recited, and then followed an enactment in correspondence with them. But as "the shortness of time" was assigned as a reason why the examination could not take place in that session, the time of beginning the undertaking, as well as the appointment of the persons who were to perform it, was left to the King's pleasure.

The statute also contained two provisions, the first of which was nothing more than a corollary from the promise of the Clergy, but the second provision was new. It declared that such Canons and Constitutions as were not contrary or repugnant to "the laws, statutes, and customs of the realm," nor prejudicial to the royal prerogative, should still be used and executed, until the thirty-two commissioners had completed their labours.

This provision is the foundation, unsound as it is, on which the authority of the Canon law in England now stands<sup>1</sup>. It is, doubtless, an absurdity, that, when the yoke of Rome was thrown off, the English Church should be governed by the pontifical law, or rather that the pontifical law should still form the basis of its ecclesiastical jurisprudence. The determination of what Canons were contrary to the laws and customs of the realm, and what were consonant to them, was a branch of the prerogative which the most despotic of all the imperious monarchs of the house of Tudor was unwilling to concede. A complete

<sup>1</sup> Blackstone's Com. b. i. Introdue. §. 3. p. 82. The matter appears to be rightly stated by Blackstone, notwithstanding the objections of his latest annotator, Coleridge, v. note.

body of English ecclesiastical law on Protestant principles, sanctioned by the King, the Parliament, and the Convocation, after many abortive attempts, was laid aside, till the British constitution was so improved, that its want was no longer experienced.

A third Statute passed in this Session, relative to the ecclesiastical state, regulated the election and consecration of Bishops<sup>m</sup>. They were no longer to be presented to the See of Rome, nor to sue for Bulls there; but all Bishops were to be presented to the Archbishop of the province, and all Archbishops to any other Archbishop within the King's dominions, or to any four Bishops appointed by the King. On the vacancy of a see, the King was to grant a licence for a new election, with a letter missive containing the name of the person to be elected; and twelve days after the delivery of the licence, the election was to be made and returned by the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral, or the Prior and Convent, under their seals. Then the Bishop elect was to swear fealty to the King, and a commission was to issue for his consecration and investiture. Finally, he was to do homage to the King, and then the temporalities of the see were to be restored to him. Offenders against this statute were subjected to the penalties of the statute of "præmunire."

The last Act of importance<sup>n</sup>, though not of an ecclesiastical nature, which demands notice, was that for confirming the succession to the Crown to the issue of the King by Queen Anne<sup>o</sup>. It began by stating, that distractions had arisen in England concerning the succession, and that these distractions had occasioned a large effusion of blood. To prevent the recurrence of such a calamity, the King's

<sup>m</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20.

<sup>n</sup> There was a private Act passed in this Session for depriving the Cardinals Campeggio and Jerome de Ghinucci of the Bishoprics of Salisbury and Worcester.

<sup>o</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 22.

former marriage with the Princess Catherine had been adjudged void, and the sentence of divorce pronounced by the Archbishop of Canterbury was confirmed. The Lady Catherine was thenceforth to be reputed only Princess Dowager, and not Queen; and the marriage of the King with his present Queen Anne was recognised. All the issue of the present King and Queen were legalized; the Crown was to descend to the King's issue male by his present, or by any future wife; in default of male issue to the issue female, and in default of both to the rightful heirs of the King. Any person who should maliciously divulge any thing to the slander of the King's marriage, or of the issue begotten by it, was adjudged guilty of misprision of treason, and was to suffer imprisonment at the King's pleasure, with forfeiture of goods.

Something more than negative resistance to its enactments was required by this Statute, for an oath was prescribed, that the King's subjects would defend and maintain the succession as established by law. When the Session of Parliament was ended, commissioners were sent into the different districts to receive the oath, as it was enjoined to be taken universally. The form in which it was taken is not known, and was, perhaps, varied; but two of the subscriptions made by religious houses have been preserved<sup>p</sup>. In these instruments, not only the lawfulness of the King's marriage was asserted, but the King was acknowledged Supreme Head of the Church of England, and the papal authority was disclaimed.

The Parliament which effected so great a change in the ecclesiastical polity of the realm, was seconded by the Convocation. It was debated there as a theological question, "Whether the Bishop of Rome had any greater authority given to him by God, within the realm of England, than

<sup>p</sup> One by the Prior and Convent of Langley Regis, and five other Orders; the other by the Prioress and Convent of Nuns at Deptford.—Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. 1.

any other Bishop?" It does not appear that the question was debated in the Upper House, since the Prelates had already given their votes on it in the House of Lords. In the Lower House, where the attendance was small, thirty-two decided in the negative, four in the affirmative, and one was doubtful. The Convocation of York entered into an examination of the question, and came to an unanimous decision, that the Pope had no authority in England<sup>q.</sup>

The same question was submitted to the University of Oxford, by the command of the King, signified by the Bishop of Lincoln its Chancellor. The answer of the University was addressed to all faithful sons of the Church, in the name of the Chancellor, Doctors, Regents, and Non-regents. Its purport was, that whereas the King had received the complaints and petitions of his Parliament against some foreign exactions, and controversies had arisen concerning the power and authority of the Bishop of Rome; the King, that he might satisfy his people, and yet not enact any thing contrary to the Scriptures, which he would be ready always to defend with his blood, had sent the question to be resolved by the University. Upon this requisition, and to show their duty and obedience to their Sovereign, they had assembled the whole faculty of divinity, which for many days had been employed in searching the Scriptures, and the most approved commentators, in diligently collating them, and in holding public disputations on the matter. After a discussion of five weeks, it was unanimously determined that the Bishop of Rome has no greater jurisdiction given to him by God in the holy Scriptures over the kingdom of England than any other Bishop<sup>r.</sup> (Dated June 27.)

There were many other declarations and subscriptions of a similar nature, made in consequence of these deliberations in the Convocation, and in the University.

<sup>q.</sup> Ibid. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. ii. no. 26.

<sup>r.</sup> Ibid. no. 27.

They were given by the monastic bodies as well as the secular, and in them the laws, decrees, and bulls of the Bishop of Rome were renounced for ever, and the King was acknowledged the Supreme Head of the English Church<sup>s</sup>.

Although the separation of England from the See of Rome had been effected in the preceding Session of Parliament, yet it still remained to annex by law the ecclesiastical supremacy to the Crown. This was accordingly done when the Parliament reassembled. A Statute was enacted to confirm what the Clergy had already acknowledged, that the King should be accounted as the only Supreme Head of the Church of England, called, ANGLICANA ECCLESIA, and should have full authority thereto annexed, to reform and correct all errors, heresies, and abuses, which might heretofore be amended by any spiritual jurisdiction whatsoever<sup>t</sup>.

When the King had been invested with the entire sovereignty over the Church, it seemed but a natural consequence that he should be endowed with those revenues which were paid from all ecclesiastics in England to the Pope. The Clergy had readily agreed to the Bill for the abolition of annates and first-fruits, when claimed by the See of Rome; but their concurrence might not have been so prompt, if they had imagined that the impost was not to be removed, but only transferred. A Statute was passed to vest the tenths and first-fruits in the Crown<sup>u</sup>, and that they might be paid with more fairness and equality, commissioners were appointed to make a new valuation of all ecclesiastical benefices<sup>v</sup>.

The oath to maintain the succession, framed in the former Session, was now confirmed<sup>x</sup>; for though the

<sup>s</sup> Many of these instruments are in Rymer's *Fœdera*. See Hickes' *Two Treatises*, v. ii. p. 361. Ang. Cath. Lib.

<sup>t</sup> Stat. 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. c. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. c. 2.

members of both Houses had sworn to obey the provisions of the Act, and though an oath had been taken generally to that effect, yet no particular form was enjoined. This omission was now supplied, and all persons were obliged to take the prescribed oath, when tendered to them, under the penalties of the former Statute.

The remaining Statutes, in this and the succeeding Session, against the papal jurisdiction, were in aid of those already enacted, rather than introductory of any new matter. Yet one of these must not be omitted, since it effected a material alteration in the canon law, but effected the change indirectly and almost silently. The canon law was not at once abolished, but the faculty of canonists was abrogated. The commission of thirty-two persons to revise the Ecclesiastical Canons and Constitutions, which the Statute of the preceding Session had enacted to be appointed by the King, was in this Session confirmed<sup>y</sup>. Soon afterwards the King issued a mandate to the University of Cambridge, prohibiting the reading of lectures, and the granting of degrees in canon law; and it is probable that the University of Oxford received, at the same time, a similar prohibition.

The detail already given of the different Statutes against the Papacy may be tedious, but is indispensable. Henry was now not only in name, but in reality, the Supreme Head of the English Church. The title was to be for ever joined to the other titles of royalty, and the Church was an inseparable appendage to the Crown. The title of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which had hitherto been that of Legate of the Apostolic See, was, by a decree of Convocation, changed into that of Metropolitan and Primate<sup>z</sup>.

The two Archbishops and the Bishops submitted to take out a royal commission for the exercise of their episcopal

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. 27 Hen. VIII. c. 15.

<sup>z</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. iii. p. 199.

jurisdiction<sup>a</sup>; and the King, in virtue of his new character, declared his intention of making an ecclesiastical visitation throughout the kingdom. A Vicegerent was appointed in all ecclesiastical affairs, who, in right of his office, enjoyed a precedence of rank immediately above the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a priority in power many degrees above him. An office was instituted for the transaction of all ecclesiastical affairs, under the control of this newly-created functionary, and a seal was appointed for the confirmation of his acts, and for the authentication of all documents proceeding from his authority.

In all these proceedings the Bishops and the secular Clergy, when they could not give a cordial assent, testified acquiescence. Tonstal appears to have entertained some scruples concerning the acknowledgment of the King's supremacy; but Gardiner, from his hatred of Cranmer, was willing to exalt the regal authority so as to supersede the archiepiscopal: he complained that the Archbishop's title of Primate of all England derogated from the kingly power<sup>b</sup>.

Of the few who refused to acknowledge the King's supremacy, and to take the oath of succession, the greater number belonged to the monastic orders. The reputation of these orders was now rapidly declining, and they had lately experienced the attack of a popular writer, in a treatise entitled, "The Supplication of the Beggars<sup>c</sup>."

Yet there are two remarkable exceptions to the fact, that recusancy was confined to monastics; exceptions which it would be uncandid not only to pass over in silence, but to pass over with careless or designed precipitancy. These two instances of conscientious opposition to the will of the

<sup>a</sup> Wharton's Observations on Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, p. 1051.

<sup>b</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. iii. p. 200.

<sup>c</sup> By Simon Fish, of Gray's Inn. The King had the book put into his hands by Anne Boleyn, and was much pleased with it. Ibid. vol. i. b. ii. p. 325.

Prince, and the law of the realm, and of constancy in suffering for the sake of conscience, are found in Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More. To expatiate on the character of such men is not a digression from the path, but a relaxation in the course, of historical narrative. It is to proceed with a slackened pace, when the surrounding objects afford room for interesting contemplation.

Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, had been distinguished in the reign of Henry the Seventh. During many years he was Chaplain and Confessor to Margaret, Countess of Richmond, the mother of that Prince; and was instrumental in calling forth and applying the munificence of his patroness, in the foundation of Saint John's and Christ's Colleges, in the University of Cambridge, and of theological professorships both at Cambridge and Oxford. Cambridge endeavoured to repay her obligations by electing him her Chancellor, and the Bishopric of Rochester was conferred on him by the reigning Sovereign. Following the rule of the primitive Church, he refused to exchange his see for a richer, saying, what many Prelates have before and since said, “That his Church was his wife, and that he never would be separated from her because she was poor.” He continued to enjoy the favour of Henry the Eighth until the question of the divorce was agitated, when he stood forward in favour of Catherine, supporting her by his countenance, and aiding her by his counsel, and defending her marriage in a controversial treatise.

Such inflexible resolution, exerted in such a cause, necessarily occasioned an alienation from Fisher in the mind of Henry: yet the royal aversion would perhaps have been his only misfortune, if an adherence to the cause of Catherine had been his only offence. But he was implicated in other crimes against the State, for which he had little to plead in extenuation. His piety was ardent, but debased by superstition, which his learning, though respectable for the age in which he lived, tended to cherish

rather than to counteract. Under its influence he had given credence and consequent reputation to the frenzied Elizabeth Barton, better known by the name of the “Maid of Kent.” The ravings of this woman, like those of many other religious impostors, were calculated to excite political disaffection, and her prophetic imprecations were levelled against the King and his government. She predicted, that if the King persisted in his divorce, he would not continue on his throne another month, nor continue in the favour of God another hour, and that his end would be infamous and violent. An act of attainder was therefore passed against Elizabeth Barton and her accomplices, of whom Fisher was one; and the little that could be urged in his defence was insufficient to prevent him from being adjudged guilty of misprision of treason. Imprisonment was the punishment awarded by the law for this offence, and imprisonment he might have avoided by timely submission; but his pertinacious refusal to acknowledge the King’s Supremacy, and to take the oath prescribed by the Act of Succession, completed his ruin. He suffered a rigorous confinement during more than a year, and although nearly eighty years of age, was kept without proper clothes, and denied the use of fire. One of the last acts of Clement the Seventh, before death closed his disastrous pontificate, was to raise the disgraced and imprisoned Bishop of Rochester to the dignity of a Cardinal; and this injudicious mark of respect, from an authority which the law had proscribed, heightened the indignation of Henry, and hastened the end of Fisher.

It was too notorious that the aged Prelate had spoken against the King’s Supremacy, and for this offence he was brought to a trial. A special commission was appointed, consisting of the Lord Chancellor, the Duke of Suffolk, and some other Peers, in conjunction with the Judges. By this court he was found guilty, and sentenced to die as a traitor, but by a warrant from the King his sentence was mitigated to beheading only. His death was marked by

that pious fortitude which had uniformly guided his conduct, however erroneous might have been his judgment. On the morning of his execution he dressed himself with unusual care, saying, “ That he was preparing to be a bridegroom.” As he was conducted to the place of execution, being impeded by the pressure of the crowd, with his New Testament in his hand, he prayed to this effect: that as the sacred volume had been the companion and the solace of his imprisonment, he might open on some passage which might strengthen him in his last conflict. Having thus prayed, he opened the book—let not the Christian say, fortuitously—and his eyes rested on the following passage of Saint John: “ This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.” [St. John xvii. 3.] He again closed the book with joy, and the consolatory declaration was the subject of his meditations, until his mortal existence was terminated by the hand of the executioner.

To have taken the life of Fisher at the age of fourscore was a sacrifice cruel indeed, but not costly: equal in cruelty was the execution of Sir Thomas More, more than equal in its injustice, and infinitely surpassing was the value of the victim towards whom this cruelty and injustice were shown. Since the time that he had resigned the Chancellorship, he had retired into private life with scarcely a decent competence, and had carefully separated himself from all political transactions. But to a man like More, retirement, in a time when political dissensions and religious controversies were rife, was no security. Of all the opponents of the King’s divorce he was the most formidable; for, while the arguments of Cajetan and Victoria were answered or despised, the emphatic silence of More sunk deep in the mind of Henry. His tenacity of opinion, on this point, rendered him peculiarly obnoxious to the family of Anne Boleyn, whose inquisitive vigilance was directed

to the transactions of his domestic privacy, and the conversation of his social hours.

The first attempt against his life was by involving him in the bill of attainder against the Maid of Kent and her accomplices. But here he triumphantly defeated his enemies, and the storm which fell with fatal severity on Fisher passed harmlessly over More. He petitioned that he might be allowed to plead personally in his defence against this Bill; but the King, fearful of the impression which his eloquence might make in an open court of justice, referred him to the private examination of his Council. The Lord Chancellor Audley conducted himself with bitterness towards his illustrious predecessor; but after a full, and certainly not a friendly, investigation, More was absolved from the crime of participating in the schemes of the Maid of Kent, and, by the earnest recommendation of Audley himself, was left out of the Bill.

Foiled in this attempt, his enemies next selected the Statute of Supremacy and Succession as the weapon best fitted to effect his destruction. He was reported to have said that the Statute was like a sword with two edges; since, if a man answered one way, it would confound his soul, and if he answered another way, it would confound his body; and it was resolved that he should be tried to which of these perils he chose to submit. Though the members of both Houses voluntarily took the oath of Succession before the Session closed in which the Statute passed, yet few others of the laity were required to take it. Sir Thomas More, however, was summoned to appear at Lambeth, before the Lords of the Council, that the oath might be administered to him.

Having cheerfully obeyed the summons, the Lords of the Council, by their demeanor towards him, appeared rather to debate the question with an old colleague, in amicable and equal conference, than to impose the oath on a stubborn recusant by mere authority. Cranmer had

uniformly shown towards More that tenderness and consideration which a great man always feels for a disarmed antagonist. On this occasion, the Primate, with that persuasive application for which he was so remarkable, laboured to bring the ex-Chancellor to a compliance with the parliamentary requisition. It was, as More himself acknowledged, a powerful appeal, and which, when urged with such force, he could not, at the moment, withstand.

More had repeatedly declared, at this conference, that he imputed no blame to any one who took the oath, and had also expressed his own readiness to take it with some alterations. His objection was particularly directed to the preamble of the oath; and Cranmer once more generously interposed, to obtain an indulgence for those scruples which he had vainly endeavoured to overcome. A humane and temperate letter was addressed by the Archbishop to the Secretary Cromwell, soliciting that both More and Fisher might be sworn to the Act of Succession without the preamble<sup>d</sup>. But this wise suggestion was rejected; and More, after remaining a few days in the custody of the abbot of Westminster, was, like Fisher, committed a prisoner to the Tower.

In this confinement, and in the possession of many indulgences to soften its rigour, he continued more than a year; but when the Statute of the succeeding Session was enacted, his treatment was severe. In this Statute the King was recognised as the Supreme Head of the Church, and the punishment of death was denounced against all who denied his supremacy. It was not likely that More, in a state of imprisonment, should commit any overt act in disobedience to the Statute<sup>e</sup>, and there was a great difficulty in rendering him liable to its penalties. Artifices were therefore used to elicit from him some opinion or sentiment by which he might be convicted; and some of the Lords of

<sup>d</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. i. c. 6. p. 39.

<sup>e</sup> Carte's Hist. Eng. b. xv. p. 131.

the Council visited him in the Tower, in order to draw from him some decisive answer concerning his opinion on the lawfulness of the Statute. It was useless that he proposed in general terms his allegiance to the King: he was required to give a categorical answer to these two distinct interrogatories: first, whether he had seen the Statute concerning the supremacy? and, secondly, whether or not he believed it to be a lawful Statute? Having refused a direct reply to these interrogatories, the Lords retired; but he was soon arraigned for high treason, chiefly on the report of certain seditious words spoken by him in the presence of Rich, the Solicitor General.

His trial on this arraignment took place in the Court of King's Bench, not only before the Judges, but also before other commissioners appointed for that purpose, of whom the Lord Chancellor was the principal. Though his bodily frame was feeble, his mind had lost nothing of its vigour. Throughout his trial he displayed a solicitude to maintain his integrity and honour, rather than to preserve his life; and if he had been tried by unprejudiced judges, his life would have been as safe as his character. But unavailing were his arguments and his eloquence, in averting a sentence already predetermined. He was condemned to suffer death as a traitor, and after his sentence, when the commissioners offered to hear any thing in his defence, his reply was such as Christian piety could alone inspire. If it should remind the reader of the concluding part of the *Apology of Socrates*, it must at the same time convince him of the superiority of the Christian over the Pagan philosopher. It would have been worthy of Socrates, if Socrates had been enlightened by divine revelation. The concluding words of his address were these: "My Lords, more I have not to say, but that, like as the blessed Apostle Saint Paul, as we reade in the Acts, was present and consented to the death of Saint Stephen, and kept the cloathes of them that stoned him, and yet be they both

twaine compeers and holie saints in heaven, and shall continue there friends togeather for ever; so I verilie trust, and shall therefore right heartilie pray, though your Lordships have now here on earthe been my judges to my condemnation, we may yet hereafter in heaven all merrilie meet together to our everlasting salvation. And that I desire Almighty God to preserve and defend the King's Majestie, and to send him good counsell<sup>f</sup>."

Such was the end of Sir Thomas More; a name which will be ever associated with the revival of learning. His erudition, even when compared with that of his contemporaries, was surpassed; it was neither varied nor profound; but he had other and better qualities, in which he has not in any age been exceeded. His fervent piety prevented his uncommon cheerfulness from degenerating into levity, and his wit from any alliance with profaneness. His strong attachment to the Church of Rome contributed to narrow his intellect, to warp his judgment, and, though it did not diminish his vivacity, to infuse somewhat of causticity into the natural sweetness of his temper. Yet, in the happiest effort of his imaginative faculty, he soared above all superstitious prejudices. Papal tyranny and the Romish religion find no place in his Utopia: on the contrary, his Utopians have Christianity without a priesthood.

What this distinguished character might have been in an age of more general knowledge and of higher refinement, is an unprofitable speculation. As he now stands exhibited to the notice of posterity, he has been selected by the English Romanists as the bulwark of their cause. Such a choice is not discreditable to their judgment, and it is honourable to their feelings, that their favourite champion is SIR THOMAS MORE.

<sup>f</sup> Life of Sir Thomas More. Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog. vol. ii. p. 213.

## CHAPTER V.

Division of the Ecclesiastical State into Secular and Monastic.—The Monastic Orders, Military and Religious.—Religious Orders subdivided into Monks, Canons, and Friars.—Dissolution of the smaller Monasteries, and consequent Rebellion.—The greater Abbeys surrendered, and the Surrender confirmed by Law.—Chantryes and free Chapels given to the King.—Application of the Monastic Property.—New Bishoprics erected.—Cathedral Chapters founded.—General Reflections on the policy and justice of the measure.

BEFORE the Reformation, the Ecclesiastical State of England, like the rest of the Western Church, was divided into the *seculars* and *monastics*, or, as the latter were usually styled, the *regulars*. This was more than a nominal division, for it had the practical effects of a religious schism. The monastic orders were called, not unaptly, the standing army of the popedom: they defended its usurpations on the temporal and spiritual liberties of Christendom: in return, they obtained an exemption by papal bulls and dispensations, both from civil authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The secular clergy stigmatized the regulars as an ambiguous class, as neither clerics nor laics; an acolyth, by the canonists, was ranked above an abbot; and the whole monastic body was studiously marked as standing without the pale of ecclesiastical privilege.

The same Statute which enacted that the King should be the head of the English Church, had transferred from the Pope to the King the jurisdiction over all monastic institutions. The Crown was invested with a power of visiting them by commission, and the election of their superiors, which had formerly been confirmed by the Pope, was in future to be confirmed by the King.

When Henry was invested with the supremacy, Cromwell, who filled the place of his chief minister, was appointed his ecclesiastical Vicegerent. The ecclesiastical administration of this statesman may be correctly estimated from a measure of which he may claim exclusively the merit or the disgrace; and the epithet by which he was long distinguished was that of Monasticomastix, or the scourge of monasteries.

It is impossible to form a just notion of the change produced by the dissolution of the monastic corporations, without a short account of their origin and establishment in England. This account will be followed by a narrative of their dissolution at the time of the Reformation, and the subject will be concluded by some reflections on the policy and justice of this important revolution.

In the classification of the monastic orders, the first grand division is into *military* and *religious*. The religious orders had no connexion with the duties and obligations of a military life; but the military orders were founded on religious principles, and were bound by religious ties.

Of the three famous military orders, which had their origin during the wars between the Christians and Mohammedans for the recovery of Palestine, that of the Teutonic Knights was confined to Germany, but the other two orders, of Templars and Hospitallers, enrolled among their members the flower of the European nobility.

The Knights Templars derived their appellation from a palace adjoining the Temple at Jerusalem, appropriated to their use; but, from their habit, of a white mantle with a red cross, they were better known by the title of the Red Cross Knights<sup>s</sup>. The design of their institution was to defend the common cause of Christianity, to inspect the

<sup>s</sup> The founders of the order were Hugues des Payens, Geoffry of St. Aldemar, or St. Omer, and seven other persons, whose names are unknown. Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. vi. p. 21.

public roads, and to protect the pilgrims who visited the  
 1118 holy city from the insults and barbarity of the  
 Moslems. The twelfth century is mentioned as the date of their institution, but they did not acquire stability  
 1228 till the thirteenth century, when the order of Templars was solemnly confirmed by a Council at Troyes, and subjected to a rule of discipline framed by Saint Bernard. By the valour of its Knights the order gradually acquired immense riches, and a military renown greater even than its wealth. In England, no religious community was so highly esteemed as that of the Templars: its Monarchs deposited much of their treasure in the Temple at London, while the Knights were in possession of that house. Henry the Second, and his Queen, Eleanor, desired to be interred there, and it was there that Henry the Third received his education<sup>h</sup>.

But the martial fame and chivalrous exploits of the Templars could not secure the permanence of the order, while its wealth invited envy and rapacity. In the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Knights 1307 were publicly accused as enemies and deriders of Christianity, and the accusation was entertained, though its author was one whose testimony should have been received with caution. The charge was preferred by Philip the Fair, "the monster of his age!" He addressed his complaints to Clement the Fifth, himself an avaricious, turbulent, and vindictive Pontiff. But even Clement could see that the charges against the Templars were either groundless or exaggerated, and was unwilling to proceed against them, until wearied by the importunities of the French King.

At length all the Templars, who were dispersed throughout the different countries of Europe, were seized and imprisoned, without any warning or apprehension of their approaching danger, and the order was

<sup>h</sup> Mills's History of the Crusades, vol. ii. c. 7. p. 308, note.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. vol. ii. c. 7. p. 298.

extirpated by a decree of the Council of Vienne. Some of the Knights, while under the actual infliction or the prospective dread of torture, confessed their guilt; but James de Molai, the grand master, with his dying breath asserted, that his greatest crime had been that of charging the Templars with disbelief of Christianity through fear of the rack. William de la Moore, the English grand prior, was the only man whom no terror could induce to retract his first avowal of the innocence of his order. He was requested to make a general confession; but he replied, that he was not guilty of heresy, and would not abjure crimes which he had never committed<sup>k</sup>.

The wealth of the Templars might of itself have been a sufficient motive with Philip the Fair to seek their ruin: but he had a stronger motive in his personal resentment against their grand master, and in his hatred of the whole order. The Templars had espoused the cause of Boniface the Eighth, when that Pontiff and Philip were engaged in a quarrel: their conduct was remembered by Philip, and repaid by their destruction.

The possessions of the Red Cross Knights were decreed by the Council of Vienne to be transferred to a rival order of still greater wealth than the Templars, the order of Hospitallers. The Hospitallers, or the Knights of Saint John of Jerusalem, were so called from an hospital in that city, dedicated to Saint John the Baptist, in which certain pious and charitable brethren were employed in relieving the sick and indigent pilgrims. When Jerusalem became the metropolis of a new kingdom, the revenues of the hospital were so greatly augmented by the liberality of Christian princes, as far to exceed the purposes for which the order was founded. Hence, Raymond de Puy, the superior of this charitable foundation, offered to make war on the Moslems at his own expense, and his offer was seconded by his brethren. The proposal was accepted by

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. vol. ii. c. 7. p. 314.

Baldwin the Second, then King of Jerusalem; and thus a fraternity of ascetic monks was transformed into a band of hardy warriors<sup>1</sup>.

The order of the Hospitallers differed from that of the Templars in this respect, that it was divided into three classes. The first contained the knights or soldiers of illustrious birth; the second consisted of the priests, who officiated in the churches belonging to the order; and the third comprehended the serving brethren, or soldiers of low condition. The habit of the order was a black mantle with a white cross: on the last of these accounts they were called White Knights, and from the circumstance that black was the usual monastic colour, they were sometimes called Military Friars.

Though, by the decree of the Council of Vienne, the possessions of the dissolved Templars were given to the Knights of Saint John, and though this decree had been in England confirmed by Parliament, yet private avarice counteracted the law. The Hospitallers were obliged to purchase of the King, and even of individuals, the confiscated estates of the Red Cross Knights. The Earls of Lancaster and Pembroke, and the younger Spencer, had successive grants of the Temple in London; but, in consequence of death or attainder, it reverted to the Crown. The Hospitallers did not gain possession of the house till the reign of Edward the Third: they soon demised it to the common lawyers, and the lawyers held it as tenants to the Hospitallers till the dissolution of the order.

When the Knights of Saint John were compelled to leave their possessions in Palestine, they soon acquired an equivalent in Europe, and, dependent only on their grand master, enjoyed the sovereignty first of Rhodes, and afterwards of Malta. Though their estates in England were moderate, yet the Knights were of the highest quality. They were under the government of their grand prior,

<sup>1</sup> Vertot's Hist. des Chevaliers, &c. tom. i. p. 56.

and at the time when the Abbots enjoyed the rank and privileges of other Prelates, and when Monachism as well as Episcopacy “ exalted its mitred front in Courts and Parliaments,” the Prior of Saint John of Jerusalem was honoured by the title of the first lay Baron of England.

Having briefly described the military orders, those which were peculiarly styled religious demand notice; and they will require a more copious explanation, because their specific differences were numerous. The religious orders have been classed under three principal divisions, *Monks*, *Canons*, and *Friars*.

I. The Benedictine order, with its ramifications, is the first, both in antiquity and importance. Its founder, Benedict of Nursia, in the dukedom of Spoleto in Italy, instituted it in the middle of the sixth century; <sup>529</sup> and from his rule of discipline, which is yet extant, it may be concluded that he intended to form an order whose discipline should be milder, but whose manners should be more regular, than those of other monastic bodies. His design was judiciously conceived, for, during many centuries, the Benedictine order maintained an undisputed preeminence in the monastic republic.

As to the time when this order was established in England, a controversy has arisen, which may well be left undetermined. While some writers have fixed the period of its introduction at the time of Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury; others have denied that the Benedictine rule was observed or known till after the Conquest. Bede, in his history, is silent as to the order, though himself a Monk; and a writer of later date has attempted to prove, that the Benedictines came into England immediately from France<sup>m</sup>. After all the researches into this subject, the following appears to be the fair conclusion,

<sup>m</sup> Broughton's *Monastichon Britanicum*. Lond. 1655. ch. xx. Its author was a Romish priest, and died 1654. His work was left by him unfinished.

that the Benedictine rule was the groundwork of the monastic establishments before the Conquest; but that it was not completely known and observed till after that event, or till the time of Lanfranc. That the rule, however, was partially known before the Conquest is probable from this single fact, that the most wealthy Monasteries were founded under the Saxon Kings, and that these Monasteries were called Benedictine from their foundation. Not only the richest Abbeys, but all the Cathedral Priories, with the exception of Carlisle, were of the Benedictine order<sup>n</sup>.

The habit of the Benedictines was entirely black; their gowns, their cowls, and their scapularies were of this colour, and hence they were commonly known by the name of Black Monks. The rule, as it was observed in England, was strict. Devotional exercises suspended all other occupations, seven times in twenty-four hours<sup>o</sup>, and the circle of these exercises had a reference to the Death and Passion of Christ. The prescribed austerities of the Benedictines were numerous; but they were not allowed to practise any voluntary penance without the permission of their superior. They were not permitted to converse in their refectory at their meals, but were enjoined to listen to some portion of the Scriptures. They all slept in a common dormitory, but were supplied with separate beds scantily furnished. For slight faults they were excluded from meals; for greater they were deprived of religious communion; for incorrigible faults they were expelled.

The Benedictine order was subdivided into many branches, some of which obtained great notoriety. The Cluniac order wore the Benedictine habit, but varied in 927 their discipline from the Benedictine rule, or rather from its founder; for Odo, Abbot of Clugni, added to

<sup>n</sup> Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. ix.

<sup>o</sup> These exercises were called the nocturnal, matins, the tierce, the sexte, the none, vespers, and the compline.

the ancient rule of Benedict many severe and burdensome ceremonies<sup>p</sup>. All the English monasteries of this branch were at first governed by foreigners, and were subjected to a foreign visitation. The Priors were not elected by their own body, but by the houses of Clugni, La Charité sur Loire, and Saint Martin-de-champs, in Paris. They could not even receive the profession of their novices in England; and, on this account, during the wars with France, the revenues of the Cluniac monasteries were seized by our Kings as alien houses. This inconvenience was removed, on the petition of a Parliament, holden at Winchester, in the reign of Edward the Third. The houses of the Cluniac order were then made denizen, and discharged from all subjection to foreign abbeys. Of the Cluniac order there were, at the time of the Reformation, twenty-seven houses<sup>q</sup>.

A second branch of the Benedictine order were the Carthusians. These followed the rule of Benedict, with many additional austeries, and were esteemed the most rigid of all the monastic orders. They were never permitted to eat flesh, and were required to fast on one day in every week on bread and water. In their clothing they were no less mortified than in their diet, and next their bodies they wore a hair shirt. Once in a week only they were permitted to walk in their grounds; but none of the fraternity were permitted to go out of their precincts, except the Priors and Procurators, and those only on urgent business. The founder of the Carthusians was Bruno, a native of Cologne, who instituted the order at Chartreux, a deserted spot near Grenoble<sup>r</sup>. The 1084 Carthusians were brought into England by Henry the Second, and had their first establishment at Witham, in Somersetshire. As to their distinguishing habit, their upper garment, like the Benedictines, was black, but the

<sup>p</sup> Helyot, Hist. des Ordres Relig. tom. v. p. 191.

<sup>q</sup> Preface to Tanner's Notitia Monastica, p. ix.

<sup>r</sup> Helyot, Hist. des Ordres Relig. tom. vii. p. 366.

rest was white. At the Reformation there were in England nine houses belonging to the Carthusian order<sup>s</sup>.

The Cistertians may be reckoned as a third branch of Benedictines. Robert, Abbot of Molesme, in Burgundy, having fruitlessly laboured to revive the decayed discipline of his convent, retired with about twenty of his fraternity to Cisteaux, a place situated in the diocese of Chalons. There he instituted this order, which was also known by <sup>1098</sup> the name of Bernardines, from Bernard, a great promoter of the Cistertian discipline. The Cistertians were also called White Monks, from their habit, which was a white cassock, with a narrow scapulary, over which they threw a black mantle when they went abroad, but a mantle of white when they went to church. Their monasteries, which were very numerous, were situated chiefly in wild and solitary places, and were all dedicated to the Blessed Virgin<sup>t</sup>. They were introduced into England by Stephen Harding, third Abbot of Cisteaux, were first established at Waverley, in Surrey, and had eighty-five houses before the dissolution<sup>u</sup>.

There were some other Benedictine branches of less consideration. That of Grammont was instituted by <sup>1073</sup> Stephen, a gentleman of Auvergne; but of this branch there were only two houses in England. The order of Tiron were also reformed Benedictines, but they had no establishment in England, and only one in Wales, that of Saint Dogmael, with a dependent cell and priory.

II. In the second general division of the religious orders were comprehended the Canons, and these were of two kinds, *religious* and *secular*. The secular Canons were merely clerics: they were, like other priests, conversant in the world, performed spiritual offices to the laity, and took on themselves the cure of souls. Such duties the

<sup>s</sup> Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. ix.

<sup>t</sup> Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres Relig.* tom. v. 341.

<sup>u</sup> Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. x.

regular Canons could not perform without a dispensation. The secular Canons differed from ordinary priests in nothing except that they lived under the government of some local statutes. They did not always live under the same roof, but had a severalty in their estates. The regular Canons lived under the same roof, and had a common dormitory; they were less strict than the Monks, but more strict than the secular Canons.

The Canons, whether secular or regular, acknowledged, as the institutor of their rule, Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, the African oracle in controversy. Their habit was a long black cassock, with a white rochet thrown over it. They submitted to the tonsure, and wore a cap. There were not less than one hundred and twenty-five houses of this order in England, and their first house was supposed to have been established at Colchester\*.

Of the subdivisions of the Augustine Canons, the best known were the Præmonstratenses. They lived according to the rule of St. Augustine, restored to its primitive severity by Norbert, afterwards Archbishop of Magdeburgh. This eminent reformer founded the order at Præmontre, in the diocese of Laon in Picardy. The Præmonstratenses were sometimes distinguished by the name of white Canons, from their habit, which was a white cassock, with a rochet thrown over it, a long white cloak, and white caps<sup>y</sup>. They came into England in the middle of the twelfth century, and settled first at Newhouse in Lincolnshire. The English of this order were originally under the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Præmontre, and had a conservator of their privileges in England. Their foreign superior asserted a right of visitation, and of exacting from them large contributions, till a Bull was obtained from Pope Julius the Second, exempting them from foreign jurisdiction, and placing them under the government of the

\* Ibid. p. xi.

<sup>y</sup> Helyot, Hist. des Ordres Relig. tom. ii. p. 156.

Abbot of Welbeck in Nottinghamshire. There were, at the time of the dissolution, about thirty-five houses of this order<sup>z</sup>.

III. The third and largest division of the religious orders comprehended the Friars, all of whom gloried in the title of mendicants. Besides a few obscure fraternities, of which the crutched or crossed Friars were the most remarkable, the orders of Friars were four, sometimes called the elemental orders<sup>a</sup>.

1. The founder of the Dominicans was by birth a Spaniard, and the village of Calaroga was the place of his nativity. His descent was noble, and his profession that of an ecclesiastic. Exasperated by the religious controversies which distracted his own country, Dominic, with a few companions, set out for France to combat the heretics and sectarians which had multiplied in that kingdom. This enterprise he executed with vigour, or rather with fury, combating the Albigenses, and other enemies of the Church, with the power of eloquence, the force of arms, the subtlety of disputation, and the terrors of the inquisition<sup>b</sup>. From France he passed into Italy, where he was distinguished by the favour of two successive Popes, Innocent III. and Honorius III., and obtained from them the privilege of erecting a new fraternity, whose principal design was the extirpation of heresy. He first adopted for his new society the rule of St. Augustine, that he might not disobey a decree of the Lateran Council, but soon exchanged the canonical discipline for the monastic. Voluntary poverty he enjoined on all his disciples, and on his deathbed denounced a heavy curse on all who might hereafter attempt to corrupt his order by an estate<sup>c</sup>. His followers were called Dominicans, from their founder, 1221

<sup>z</sup> Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. xi.

<sup>a</sup> Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. vi. p. 269.

<sup>b</sup> Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. book iii. cent. xiii. p. 558.

<sup>c</sup> Du Pin, Eccles. Hist. Cent. 13. c. x. p. 157.

preaching Friars from their office, and black Friars from their habit. In France they obtained a name which, at this day, carries with it a different association of ideas: from their residence at Paris, in a street dedicated to Saint James, still called *La Rue de St. Jacques*, they acquired the appellation of Jacobins. They were established in England in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and had their first monastery at Oxford; but they were soon transplanted to London, and were presented by the Mayor and Aldermen with two streets by the side of the river Thames. At the time of the dissolution they possessed about forty-three houses<sup>d</sup>.

The Dominicans, having a licence from the Court of Rome to preach wherever they pleased, and a general power of hearing confessions and granting absolution, made large encroachments on the rights and duties of the parochial Clergy. Being itinerant, they were generally strangers to the penitents whom they thought fit to absolve, and the people transgressed with less restraint, in the hope of obtaining absolution from some travelling Dominican.

2. Francis, the founder of the second and rival order, was by birth an Italian, and the son of a merchant. He was contemporary with Dominic, and like him gained the favour of Innocent and Honorius the Third; like him, he inculcated absolute poverty as the essence of the Gospel, and the soul of religion. But in every other respect, the tenets of the Dominicans and Franciscans were opposite, and they embraced the two extremes of fatalism and free will. Besides the general name which the Franciscans obtained from their founder, they were called minor Friars from their show of excessive humility, and gray Friars from their habit. They came into England in the reign of Henry the Third, and settled first at Canterbury, and afterwards at London.

<sup>d</sup> Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. xiii.

Some relaxation having taken place in the Franciscan rule, a division in the order ensued. Its founder had made absolute poverty an indispensable obligation, but an interpretation of the rule, sanctioned by Gregory the Ninth, mitigated its excessive severity. Innocent the Fourth confirmed the mitigated interpretation, and excited the indignation of those members who called themselves spiritual. In the schism which followed, such as continued under the relaxation were called ‘conventuals’ or ‘observants,’ and such as adhered to the ancient rule were called ‘recollects.’ At the time of the dissolution, the conventual Franciscans had about fifty-five houses in England, under seven custodies or wardenships: the recollects had only two or three houses in this country<sup>e</sup>.

3. The third of the mendicant orders were the Carmelites, or the order of our Lady of mount Carmel. Berthold, by birth a Calabrian, set out with some followers for mount Carmel, and on the spot where the prophet Elias is said to have been translated to heaven, built a cottage with a chapel, where he led a life of solitude and labour. This little colony was constantly replenished, as the original members died, until, at length, it was erected into a monastic community by Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem. By this austere Prelate a rule of discipline was framed, but it was afterwards modified and mitigated by the Popes. The order having been transplanted into Europe, obtained its rank among the mendicants. According to their own account, the Carmelites derive their origin from the prophets Elijah and Elisha, and they reject with indignation Berthold as their founder. Among other marks of their antiquity, they refer to the tonsure, and allege that this distinction had always exposed them to the scoffs of the vulgar. Their founder was reviled in the same manner by the opprobrious epithet of bald head, as he was on his journey to mount Carmel<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. p. xiii.      <sup>f</sup> Helyot, Hist. des Ordres Relig. tom. i. p. 282 sqq.

The Carmelites were not only denominated from the place where they were first established, but were commonly known by the name of white Friars from their habit. At the time of the suppression of the religious orders in England, they could boast of not less than forty-five houses <sup>g</sup>.

4. The Augustinians, or Friars Eremites of the order of Saint Augustine, occupied the fourth place among the mendicants. They had for their founder Pope Alexander the Fourth. This Pontiff having observed that the Eremites were divided into several societies, and that each followed a different rule, formed the project of uniting them in one religious order, and subjecting them to the rule of Saint Augustine. The Augustine Friars were famed for their skill in disputation, and a scholastic exercise at Oxford, called Augustinian, long preserved the memory of their syllogistic prowess<sup>h</sup>. Their first settlement in England was in the thirteenth century, and they possessed about thirty-two houses at the time of the Reformation<sup>i</sup>.

As these four mendicant orders were allowed the liberty of travelling wherever they thought fit, of preaching to the multitude, and of instructing youth, they were regarded with blind veneration by the ignorant<sup>j</sup>. This enthusiastic

<sup>g</sup> Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. xiv.

<sup>h</sup> Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. vi. p. 277. One exercise for a Master's degree was the *Augustine Disputations*.

<sup>i</sup> Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. xiv.

<sup>j</sup> They were also satirized, of which the following lines are a specimen :

“ Per decies binos Sathanas capiat Jacobinas ;  
Propter et errores, Jesu ! confunde Minores ;  
Augustinenses, pater inclyte, sterne per enses ;  
Et Carmelitas tanquam falsos Eremitas ;  
Sunt confessores dominorum seu dominarum,  
Et seductores ipsarum sunt animarum.”

Wiclif constantly inveighed against the Friars, under the name of

attachment was carried to such a degree, that several cities were cantoned into four parts, in reference to the four orders; the first part was assigned to the Dominicans, the second to the Franciscans, the third to the Carmelites, and the fourth to the Augustinians<sup>k</sup>.

With respect to the female devotees of monachism, it is sufficient to remark, generally, that there were Nuns of most of the religious orders, and comprehended under the same divisions. Three societies in England, however, merit a distinct notice. 1. The Nuns of the order of Fontevrault, of which the abbess of Fontevrault was superior: they had their first establishment at Nuneaton in Warwickshire, and only two other houses. 2. The Nuns of the order of Saint Clare, or, as they were denominated from their scanty endowments, the ‘poor Clares.’ Saint Clare was born in the same town, and was contemporary with Saint Francis; and the Nuns of Saint Clare, observing the Franciscan rule, were sometimes called Minoresses, and their house, without Aldgate in London, was called the Minories. Blanche, Queen of Navarre, first introduced them into England. 3. Brigittines, or Nuns of our holy Saviour, instituted by Bridget, duchess of Nercia, in Sweden, about the middle of the fourteenth century. They followed the rule of Saint Augustine, with some additions. There was but one house in England belonging to the Brigittine Nuns, the celebrated establishment at Sion house in Middlesex<sup>l</sup>.

To fix the precise number of the religious orders is im-

CAIM \*. This word is an acrostic of the four orders, viz. C, Carmelites; A, Augustinians; I, Jacobins, or Dominicans; and M, Minorites, or Franciscans. Fuller's Church History, b. vi. p. 268.

<sup>k</sup> Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. b. iii. cent. xiii. p. 558.

<sup>l</sup> Preface to Tanner's Notitia Monastica, p. xiii.

\* In Wiclif's time Caim was written for Cain in his Translation of the Ep. of St. Jude; at v. 11. it is written “Caym.” Lewis's Life of Pecock, c. iii. sect. 61. p. 99.

possible, because historians disagree on this point, confounding specific with generic distinctions<sup>m</sup>. But a just idea may be formed of their political importance, by taking a cursory survey of their different establishments in the metropolis at the time of the Reformation. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, London might be called THE CITY OF MONASTERIES.

Pre-eminent in majesty, and venerable in age, rose the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster. Its chartered privileges, originally granted by the pious munificence of Saxon Kings, were transmitted through all the vicissitudes of conquest and usurpation, of foreign invasion and domestic feud. Its cloisters approached the perihelion of the Court; and the regal hall, whether appropriated to the purposes of council, of justice, or of festivity, only shared in the inviolability of the adjacent monastic sanctuary. Its Abbots, in the exercise of their municipal jurisdiction, possessed an authority which acquired a sanctity from their religious character, and an importance from their proximity to the seat of government. In wealth and in power they vied, not only with the Prelates, but with the nobles of the land; and when the offices of the State were chiefly filled by ecclesiastics, the Abbacy of Westminster conducted its possessor to the acme of political elevation. The territorial lordship of the Abbey extended far towards the confines of the city, to which the name of Covent Garden still bears witness; and over several religious houses in the western suburb, the Abbots of Westminster claimed a right of patronage or visitation.

While the Carthusians practised their austere discipline in the congenial seclusion of Smithfield, the other monastic orders were stationed among "the busy haunts of men," dispersed among the stately palaces of the nobles, or the crowded dwellings of the citizens.

At the south-western frontier of the city, and, as it were,

<sup>m</sup> Fuller's Church History, b. vi. p. 266.

a barrier to its approach, was placed the once celebrated house of the Templars, which, though despoiled of its ancient glories, still retained the vestiges of its chivalrous destination. The church, with its characteristic appendages, yet stood, as if to put calumny to the blush, as a monument of the Christian profession of the Templars, and a vindication of their injured fame. The Hospitallers succeeding the Templars in the possession of their house, with a graceful and generous reserve, had forborne to occupy the conspicuous station of their illustrious rivals, and still remained at their more retired, but not less magnificent, residence at Clerkenwell.

Under the wing of the Templars, the Carmelites, or White Friars, once enjoyed their comparatively obscure abode, but its obscurity was no protection. Its vicinity to the royal palace of Bridewell tempted the cupidity of the English Monarchs, and it had been appropriated as a demesne of the Crown. On the other side of Bridewell, and under the walls of the city, the Dominicans, or Black Friars, possessed their spacious domain, the donation of civic munificence. Within its precincts a Parliament once sat, and in the Parliament chamber Campeggio and Wolsey held their legatine court.

Within the walls of the city, the monastic establishments, if less splendid, were more numerous. The Cathedral Church of Saint Paul, under its Bishop and Chapter of secular Canons, was, indeed, of a magnitude equal to many of the suburban establishments. But there was scarcely a street or a portal uninhabited by some monastic order. While the Dominicans, as if reminiscent of the noble birth of their founder, were seated close to a royal mansion; the Franciscans, in accordance with the mercantile extraction of the rival of Dominic, were placed near a principal entrance of the city. The Augustinian Friars, no longer Eremites except in name, were mingled with the dense population of Broad-street; while, as if to

show that the fortress of London was intended only for “the pomp and circumstance” of military defence, the Crutched Friars dwelt in peaceful security on Tower-hill.

The magnitude and the influential character of the monastic institutions throughout England corresponded with their importance in the metropolis. So extensive were their territorial possessions, that twenty-eight Abbots were styled mitred<sup>m</sup>, and, like the Bishops, held their lands by a Baronial tenure under the King, and, like them also, sat in the Upper House of Parliament and Convocation. They were joined with the other spiritual lords; and as they outnumbered the Bishops, so when united with them, the spirituality fully balanced the temporal nobility.

Besides the mitred Abbeys, there were four Nunneries, Shaftesbury, Barking, Saint Mary's at Winchester, and Wilton, held of the Crown as Baronies. Though their respective superiors were exempted from an attendance in Parliament on account of their sex, yet they were obliged to send their proportion of soldiers into the field according to the value of their Knights' fees, thirteen of which were equal to a Barony.

Interwoven as the monastic state thus was with the religion and government of the country, as well as with the ties and regulations of social life, its excision required an adventurous spirit and a skilful hand. The design, however, was, perhaps, originally projected by Henry himself, and it was carried into execution by Cromwell.

In the two great questions of the King's divorce and his ecclesiastical supremacy, the secular clergy, with a few exceptions, had shown no active opposition; but the case was different with the monastic orders. They were hostile alike to the divorce, to the overthrow of the papal juris-

<sup>m</sup> The number of the mitred Abbeys is reckoned twenty-seven by Fuller, twenty-eight by Lord Herbert, and twenty-nine by Sir Edward Coke. Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii, b. iii. p. 27.

diction, and to any reformation in doctrine. This unyielding spirit was not so apparent in the parliamentary Abbots, for their dependence on the Court induced them to comply with its wishes. When Sir Thomas More scrupled to take the oath of succession, the Abbot of Westminster endeavoured to satisfy his doubts. The courtly Benedictine said, that however the matter might appear to Sir Thomas More, yet since the great council of the nation thought otherwise, he ought to conform to their opinion<sup>n</sup>.

But the mendicant orders, solely dependent on a foreign head, and connecting the King's measures with a reformation in religion, were undisguised in their hostility. Such was the violent resistance of the Franciscans to the divorce, that a Friar of that order, in a sermon delivered in the Chapel of Greenwich, compared Henry to Ahab, and prophesied that the dogs should lick his blood. On the question of the supremacy, the Franciscans were equally resolute. When the proposition was tendered to them, that the Pope has no greater jurisdiction in the kingdom of England than any other Bishop, they rejected it with indignation. When they were required to submit the question to a part of their body, and to abide by the decision, they replied, that it concerned the conscience of each individual, which ought not to submit to the conscience of another. They cited a chapter of their rule, that their order should have a Cardinal for their protector, by whose direction they were to be governed in their obedience to the holy See. They concluded by declaring, that they had sworn to follow the rule of Saint Francis, and in that rule they would live or die<sup>o</sup>.

It was probably from the disaffection of the mendicant orders to the King, as well as from their influence with

<sup>n</sup> Life of Sir Thomas More, in Words. Eccles. Biog. vol. ii. p. 211.

<sup>o</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 367.

the vulgar, that a resolution was adopted of beginning the dissolution of the monasteries with their suppression. The Friars were more dangerous to the civil power than the Monks, since they mixed with the world, and possessed all the arts of popular address and insinuation.

At the conclusion of the same year, in which the ecclesiastical vicegerency was conferred on Cromwell, a general visitation of the monasteries took place. The abuses in the religious houses was a matter of notoriety, and of general complaint, and their correction was thought to be an indispensable duty. The work was intrusted to commissioners appointed by the King's sign manual, and the appointment was confirmed under the great seal. Of these commissioners, the principal were Leighton and Lee, two civilians; and London, Dean of Wallingford. Leighton had been brought up in the service of Wolsey, together with Cromwell, and he is thought to have been the original mover of the design.

In addition to their legal authority, the commissioners were furnished with instructions to direct their inquiries: they were also supplied with injunctions in the King's name, which they were commanded to leave at every religious house. The instructions were in the form of articles, eighty-six in number, and related chiefly to religious discipline: the injunctions required, that the governors of every religious house should see that the Act of Succession was observed; that they should inculcate the King's supremacy, and that the Pope's power in England was an usurpation. Every Priest in the house was obliged to say mass daily, and to pray for the King and Queen. One or two of every religious house were to be maintained at the University, that when they were well instructed, they might return and teach others. The Abbot or Superior was daily to explain some part of the rule of the order, and to apply it according to Christ's law, to show that their ceremonies were but introductory

to true Christianity, and that religion did not consist in habits or rites, but in purity of heart and life<sup>p</sup>.

Whatever might be thought of the necessity of a visitation, and of the propriety of these injunctions, yet the manner in which the commissioners prosecuted their inquiries has incurred a severe but merited censure. Their office was in itself sufficiently invidious, but they instituted their examination only for the sake of detecting abuses, and they detected abuses, not for the sake of correction, but of punishment. The visitation of the monasteries was not to amend their morals, but to confiscate their property.

From the letters of the commissioners to Cromwell, it appeared that the religious houses were filled with profanity and crime. Many fell on their knees before the visitors, and prayed to be discharged from vows which they had been compelled to make, but were unwilling to keep. In not a few houses there were factions which led to extreme violence and cruelty, while the profligacy practised within their walls, though too notorious to be concealed, was too gross to admit of a recital.

The report of the visitors was first laid before the King, and then before the Parliament, and the morals of the small abbeys and priories were represented to be so depraved, that a Bill for their dissolution was passed without opposition<sup>q</sup>. The Act stated, as an indisputable truth, that the small religious houses had been guilty of abominable vices, and that they had shamefully wasted their property. It was therefore expedient that their members, since they had resisted all efforts to reform them, should be removed to some great monasteries, where, in the language of the statute, “religion was well kept.” It was enacted, that all houses which could not afford an annual expenditure of two hundred pounds should be suppressed, their revenues converted to better uses, and themselves compelled to reform their lives.

<sup>p</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 370.

<sup>q</sup> St. 27 Hen. VIII. c. 28.

The reason assigned for the dissolution of the small monasteries was not their wealth, but their poverty. It was not supposed, that the wealthy corporations would misapply their riches, but that the poor would resort to undue means to become rich<sup>r</sup>. Thus the storm fell chiefly on the Mendicant Friars, whose establishments consisted of few members, and, as they were much abroad, whose discipline was relaxed: yet these small houses were richer than they appeared to be, or was consistent with a vow of voluntary poverty. The superiors received large fines, and low annual rents, and by this contrivance, while they were themselves enriched, they maintained only a small number of brethren. Many houses, then rated at two hundred pounds, were actually worth as many thousands. When the Bill for their dissolution was in its progress through the House of Lords, Stokesly, Bishop of London, said, “ These smaller houses were as thorns soon plucked up, but the great Abbots were like putrefied oaks; yet they must needs follow, and so would others in Christendom before many years were passed.”

For the better regulation of the revenues arising from the dissolved monasteries, they were given to the King for ever. By another Statute<sup>s</sup>, a new Court was erected, called the ‘Court of augmentations of the King’s revenue,’ and this Court was enabled to receive the rents and profits of all the suppressed or dissolved monasteries, with the exception of such as were continued by the King’s letters patent. The Court was likewise invested with a power of selling the lands of such houses, if it conduced to the

<sup>r</sup> Two principles were laid down in the preamble of the Statute; first, that the smaller convents were the greatest sinners, and they who had the least lands led the lewdest lives; secondly, it was harder to reform little convents than those that were greater. Fuller’s Ch. Hist. b. vi. p. 373.

<sup>s</sup> St. 27 Hen. VIII. c. 27.

King's service. It was composed of a chancellor, a treasurer, and two auditors, besides inferior officers; and it had power to summon three discreet persons of the county where the religious house was situated, and who had been previously nominated by the King. These three persons, in conjunction with an auditor and a clerk, were to signify to the house the statute of dissolution; to demand from the superior, or some accredited officer, its true state; to require his attendance before the Court; and, in the mean time, not to meddle with the property of the house. They were to ascertain the number of religious in the house; how many of these were priests, and how many were willing to embrace a secular life. They were to examine the fabric of the house, and the amount of its debts: such of its members as were inclined to go into the world were to appear before the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Lord Chancellor, to receive capacities, and were to be assigned a reasonable compensation to defray their removal. The governor of the house was to be remitted to the Court of augmentations, who were to assign an annual pension to him for the remainder of his life.

The historians and annalists of these times have furnished a melancholy detail of the manner in which the Court exercised its powers. The number of religious houses dissolved under the first Act has been computed at three hundred and seventy-six; the rents of the dissolved houses have been estimated at thirty-two thousand pounds; and their moveable property has been valued at more than three times that sum<sup>t</sup>. The buildings, including the Churches, were for the most part razed, and the materials exposed to public sale. Ten thousand persons were thrown upon the world, deprived of their usual means of subsistence; and some of them, at an advanced age, were compelled to

<sup>t</sup> Lord Herbert's Life of Hen. VIII. p. 507.

follow a secular occupation, which they had also the harder task to learn<sup>u</sup>.

Various expedients were adopted to mitigate the discontent incidental on the suppression of the smaller monasteries. The abuses which prevailed in them were exposed to public view, with every circumstance of exaggeration. The lands of the dissolved houses were sold at a low price, or given away to the gentry of the several counties, and on a tenure which compelled the grantees or purchasers to exercise hospitality and charity. Still more, the King availed himself of a clause in the Statute of Dissolution, enabling him to continue such monasteries as he might think expedient; and, by virtue of this clause, he restored fifteen abbeys and sixteen nunneries\*. These restored foundations were bound by their new tenures to pay tenths and first-fruits to the Crown, and to obey all the statutes which might be transmitted from the King, as Supreme Head of the Church.

Notwithstanding these concessions, the dissolution of the small monasteries was regarded by the wealthy corporations with alarm, and the crowds of wanderers who were thrown on their charity excited their displeasure. A royal letter, addressed to them for the purpose of allaying their fears, tended rather to excite their suspicions. Rebellion, the consequence of discontent, followed: it began in the county of Lincoln, and was headed by one Mackarel, Prior of Barlings<sup>y</sup>; and it assumed a formidable aspect in the county of York. The march of the rebels was styled by themselves the *Pilgrimage of Grace*, and one of their avowed objects was the restoration of the suppressed monasteries; but, like other unsuccessful insurgents, they accelerated the evil which they intended to prevent. The

<sup>u</sup> Stowe's Annals. Collier's Eccl. Hist. p. ii. b. ii. p. 321. Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 447.

<sup>x</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. ii. no. iii.

<sup>y</sup> Collier, Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. ii. p. 371.

malcontents having been defeated by the Duke of Suffolk, and afterwards by the Duke of Norfolk, disaffection was overawed, but not removed; and the King, taking advantage of the panic, instituted a second visitation of the monasteries.

The visitors were now enjoined to be more rigid in their inquiries. They were to examine into the domestic life of the several religious houses, to ascertain how their members were affected towards the government of the King, and especially his ecclesiastical supremacy; they were particularly to inquire what their behaviour had been during the late commotions.

To avoid a scrutiny which might terminate unfavourably for their reputation, or which, however it terminated, would not avert their ruin, many of the greater monasteries surrendered to the King. The governors were induced to adopt this measure from various motives. Some had been actually and notoriously implicated in the late rebellion, others had been guilty of immorality and peculation, and a few were inclined to a reformation in religion. Barlow, Bishop of St. David's, not only surrendered his own monastery at Bushlism, but prevailed on many other superiors of religious houses to follow his example. In many houses, the superior and his fraternity were not sorry to be released from their vows and restrictions, and to secure, by a ready submission, a competent provision, unfettered by duty. Others aspired to ecclesiastical dignities, and their prompt compliance with the wishes of the Court was the price of their advancement. In some houses, on a vacancy of the superior's place, a successor was appointed, with a condition that he should surrender the house. On all these accounts, a large number of monasteries were resigned into the King's hands, before any Statute was passed for their dissolution.

The general form of these surrenders was, that the superior and brethren, after full deliberation of their own

proper motion, for certain just and honourable causes, did freely and of their own accord give and grant their houses to the King. Those who were truly conscientious rejected the plea of conscience, and tendered their resignations without assigning any reason for their conduct.

Those who did not resign were obliged to undergo the inquisition of the visitors, and many could not withstand such authoritative and powerful appeals. There were some instances where the visitors not only induced the governor and brethren to resign, but to sign a confession of their former scandalous and immoral lives. The Prior and Benedictines of Saint Andrew, in Northampton, acknowledged, in the instrument of surrender, that they had neglected the worship of God, lived in idleness, gluttony, and sensuality, for which offences the pit of hell was ready to swallow them up<sup>z</sup>.

Although the perspicacity of the visitors in discovering the corruptions of the monasteries was quickened by the hope of sharing in the plunder, yet in some instances they left an honourable testimony to the excellent discipline of the house. They even recommended that some houses should be spared. The Prior of Great Malvern, in the county of Worcester, was recommended by Bishop Latimer to Cromwell, with an earnest desire that his house might stand, “not in monkery, but so as to be converted to study and prayer.” He was represented by the Bishop as a man of great worth, conspicuous for his hospitality and alms-giving. To this commendation Latimer, however animated by zeal against the corruptions of the Romish Church, could not forbear to add: “Alas! my good lord, shall we not see two or three in every shire changed to such a remedy<sup>a</sup>? ” The visitors also earnestly interceded for the

<sup>z</sup> Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 475.

<sup>a</sup> Anne Boleyn was altogether averse to the suppression of religious houses, and put Hugh Latimer on preaching before the King against it. Collier’s Eccl. Hist. p. ii. b. ii. p. 381.

nunnery of Godstow, near Oxford, where a great strictness of discipline was observed. Of such reputation was this house, that the nobility and gentry of the county joined in the petition of the visitors that the nunnery might be spared, since it was the usual place of female education.

While a few institutions were of such high merit as to endure an ordeal so severe, others of at least questionable utility endeavoured to escape it by offering bribes and pensions. The Prior of Canterbury, and the Abbot of Saint Edmondsbury, are recorded to have tried this expedient with Cromwell. The Abbot of Bury settled an annuity of ten pounds on Cromwell, and another of the same value on his son. But such arts had no effect with the Vicegerent; he had more prevalent motives, and more tempting promises on the other side<sup>b</sup>.

As there were some of the superiors whom nothing could intimidate, or induce to betray their trust, recourse was had to violent expedients. Some of the Abbots were attainted, and in consequence of their attainder their lands were confiscated; whereas the offence of any ecclesiastical incumbent must be personal, and his benefice incapable of moral or political delinquency; his estates are not estates of inheritance, and not like those subjected to the laws of forfeiture. But in the case of the Prior of the Charter-house in London, there was not even a pretence of guilt in the superior. Several of the Carthusian monks had been executed for denying the King's supremacy, and others, whose guilt was less evident, had been sentenced to confinement in their cells for life; but of the Prior, one of the visitors<sup>c</sup> testified that he was a man of unbounded charity, and that the eyes of the people were much on that house. A recommendation was added by the visitor, that the house should be preserved for the good of the kingdom,

<sup>b</sup> Collier's Ecclesiastical History, p. ii. b. iii. p. 6.

<sup>c</sup> Thomas Bedyl, in a letter to Archbishop Cranmer. Strype's Eccles. Mem. vol. i. c. 36. p. 429.

enforced by this just reflection : “ London is the common country of all lands, whence is derived to all parts of the kingdom all good and evil accidents here.” The representation was unavailing ; the Prior was compelled to resign, with a confession, that many of the Carthusians had offended the King, so that their goods might be justly confiscated, and themselves adjudged to death, but that they desired to avert the merited punishment by a humble submission and surrender.

The facility with which some of these resignations were procured, and the unjustifiable methods by which the others were extorted, occasioned doubts of their legality. To silence any cavils of this kind, an Act was passed to convey all religious houses already dissolved, or to be dissolved hereafter, to the King and his heirs for ever<sup>d</sup>. It was recited in the Statute, that many Abbots and Priors, and other heads of religious houses, had, voluntarily, and without restraint or compulsion, given them up to the King. Those resignations which were undoubtedly made illegally, the Statute legalized.

The mitred Abbots continued their parliamentary attendance until this Act passed. They made no protestation, though at the first reading of the Bill eighteen Abbots were present, at the second reading twenty, and at the third reading seventeen. The Bill, originated in the House of Lords, was soon sent down to the Commons, and finally received the royal assent.

The surrender or dissolution of all the great abbeys was the immediate consequence of this Statute. Of the twenty-eight mitred abbeys, twenty-five were surrendered ; all their Abbots were assigned a liberal pension, and some were remunerated by other ecclesiastical dignities. Benson, the last Abbot of Westminster, having surrendered, his abbey was converted into a deanery, and he was appointed the first Dean. Chambers, the Abbot of Peterborough,

<sup>d</sup> Stat. 31 Hen. VIII. c. 13.

when a see was founded there, was consecrated its Bishop; and the Abbot of Evesham was rewarded by the deanery of Worcester<sup>e</sup>.

The three Abbots of Glastonbury, Reading, and Colchester alone, had sufficient constancy not to survive the spoliation of their property and the extinction of their order. Next to Westminster, Glastonbury was the richest monastery in England, and, like that, could boast of a Saxon King for its founder. Its Abbot, Richard Whiting, was accused of sending the plate and money of his abbey to assist the rebels in the north, and of having in his possession a treatise against the King's divorce; but after a deliberate comparison of the contradictory accounts of his trial and execution<sup>f</sup>, the candid historian will conclude, that his incompliance with the views of the Court, and his refusal to surrender his abbey, were his greatest crimes.

A separate Bill was in the next Session brought into Parliament, and a Statute enacted for the suppression of the Knights of Saint John of Jerusalem<sup>g</sup>. Their grand master had possession of the island of Malta, which had been guaranteed to the order by the Emperor Charles the Fifth, as a compensation for the loss of Rhodes; and as the fraternity was dependent both on the Emperor and the Pope, it was thought inexpedient that any branch of the establishment should be permitted to continue in England. Selden, in his 'Table Talk,' says that Sir William Weston, the Prior, had sought refuge in France, and had resisted the general Statute of dissolution; but to the particular Statute directed against the Hospitallers he was compelled to submit. Though the order was dissolved, yet, as the Knights were of high extraction, pensions were bestowed on them suitable to their rank. Seventeen

<sup>e</sup> Willis's History of Mitred Abbeys, pp. 97, 150, and 208.

<sup>f</sup> Godwin, Annal. Sander. Schism. Engl. p. 137. Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 280. Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. iii. p. 25.

<sup>g</sup> Stat. 32 Hen. VIII. c. 24.

knights had annuities, varying from two hundred to thirty pounds; ten novices had each a pension of ten pounds, and the total amount of the pensions was nearly equal to the annual rent of the estates. One thousand pounds was the annuity assigned to Sir William Weston for the loss of his dignity, but he died on the day of the dissolution of his order. "His hospital," observes Fuller, "and his earthly tabernacle were buried together; and gold, though a great cordial, could not cure a broken heart."

These confiscations of the greater and less monasteries were not sufficient; for, some years after, a third Statute conveyed<sup>h</sup> all colleges, chantries, chapels, 1545 and hospitals consisting of secular priests, to the King and his successors. To the operation of this Act the Universities were subjected, and it was not till after strong remonstrances had been presented, that their rights were secured by another law, by which they were exempted from the general dissolution.

The number of monasteries dissolved in England and Wales, according to the most accredited computation, was six hundred and forty-five, the number of colleges was ninety; besides two thousand three hundred chantries and free chapels, and one hundred and ten hospitals. The nominal value of the rental of the dissolved houses was £142914 12s. 9d.<sup>1/4</sup>. "Bp. Burnet has supposed this not to have been more than the tenth part of the real value;—a very improbable supposition." (Tanner's Nat. Mon. p. lvii.)

Various projects were announced for the application of this enormous mass of wealth thus suddenly thrown on the disposal of the Crown; but the abandonment of these schemes induces a suspicion that they were never seriously entertained. At one time it was proposed to found a college on an extensive scale for the study of the civil law, and the Latin and French languages; and a plan of the projected institution, drawn by Sir Nicholas Bacon at the

<sup>h</sup> Stat. 37 Hen. VIII. c. 4.

King's command is yet extant. Its object was to qualify students for diplomatic situations, and for the office of accredited and national historians.

Prospects of national advantage were also opened, which a short time proved to be fallacious or visionary<sup>i</sup>. It was stated to the Parliament that the monastic property was not to be converted to private use, but that the Exchequer was to be enriched, "to the King's honour," and to the ease and benefit of the subject. Subsidies, loans, and all other imposts, were no longer to be levied; for this addition to his revenue would enable the King to defend his dominions against insurrection or invasion.

The catastrophe showed that these statements were false, and these anticipations vain. Whether from policy or from prodigality, by far the most valuable part of the monastic property was given away, or sold at a low rate, to the favourites of the Court. Their new owners enjoyed it on the same tenure, and with the same exemptions, as the monastic corporations. A clause in one of the Statutes of Dissolution provided, that all churches and chapels which belonged to the monasteries, and were formerly exempted from the visitation or jurisdiction of their ordinary, should be within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese where they were situated, or of any other that should be appointed by the King. The latter part of this clause vitiated the intention of the whole Act. The purchasers of the abbey lands, with their impropriated tithes, obtained by an express grant the right of visitation over those churches and chapels which were formerly exempted. Hence, not only the incumbents of these parishes were destitute of any other than an arbitrary pension from their patrons, but were freed from ecclesiastical restraint. This abuse has sensibly operated to the subversion of discipline, and the scandal of religion.

<sup>i</sup> On the accession of Queen Mary, the treasury was exhausted. See chap. xi. of this vol.

A small part of the monastic spoils was applied to the foundation of new Bishoprics. The abbey of Westminster was converted into an episcopal see, with the necessary officials of a cathedral and choir. This foundation soon reverted to its former collegiate state; but five other sees, founded by Henry the Eighth, yet subsist. The monastery of St. Werburgh, at Chester, was converted into a Bishopric, with a Deanery and six Prebends. The abbey of Peterborough was erected into a Bishop's see, with a similar establishment, as was also the monastery of St. Augustine at Bristol. From the abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester was founded a fourth Bishopric and Chapter: a fifth was constituted from the abbey of Oseney, near Oxford; but the Bishop was styled of Oxford, and his cathedral was soon fixed at Christ Church, the Dean and Canons of the college forming his episcopal Chapter. The University of Oxford was exempted by prescription and charter from episcopal and archidiaconal jurisdiction, and with these academical privileges the new foundation did not interfere.

Another portion of the monastic property was restored to the Church in the foundation of cathedral establishments. It was not the design of Cranmer, as is commonly supposed, to abolish these establishments, but to reform them; and, from being places of idleness and sensuality, to make them seminaries of learning. His intention was, that in every cathedral there should be a competent provision for readers in divinity, and in the Greek and Hebrew languages; and that its Chapter should be the theological college of the whole diocese.

In consequence of his recommendation, some of the cathedral and conventional Chapters were founded on a new model; though even in their old state they were far more regular and useful than the abbeys. The metropolitan Chapter of Christ Church in Canterbury called forth the

commendation of Cranmer, and obtained the favour of Cromwell. Goldwell, the prior, was nominated by Cranmer one of the prebendaries on the new foundation, and not less than twelve members of the priory were transferred into the Chapter<sup>k</sup>.

These episcopal and capitular foundations, with a few eleemosynary endowments of less importance, were all that was preserved to the Church from the wreck of the monasteries; and here the historical part of the subject ends. But it would be an unsatisfactory termination to close the narrative without some reflections on the policy and justice of this measure, without viewing it in its relation to the interests of religion, the constitution of civil government, and the habits of domestic life. The subject may now be approached without any of those feelings which once rendered its discussion hazardous, or at best unprofitable. Where curiosity can examine without violent emotion, there contemplation may expatiate without interested prejudice.

1. Whatever difference of opinion may still exist on the general utility of monastic institutions, yet there can be none on the manner in which their suppression was effected in England under Henry the Eighth. All the writers of the best reputation who lived near the time, however opposed in political or religious principles, speak the unvaried and unanimous language of indignant lamentation. It is by these writers that the extent of the calamity can be fairly estimated, because they saw the wounds inflicted by sacrilege while they were yet green. Bale, the centurist, a man remarkably averse from popery and all its appendages, breaks out into the strongest tone of remonstrance against the indiscriminate pillage of the monasteries. Fuller, an historian with feelings naturally equable,

<sup>k</sup> Willis's Hist. of Mitred Abbeys, vol. i. p. 38. and p. 247.

utters a passionate declamation on the atrocity of the deed. Spelman condemns the destruction of the monasteries from a dread of profanation, Dugdale from a love of recondite learning, and Selden from a hatred of arbitrary power.

2. The measure was carried into execution in a manner which fully justifies the representations of contemporary writers. It was marked not only by rapacious avarice, but by a wanton and reckless love of plunder and devastation. Edifices, the pride and boast of sacred architecture, were desecrated with more than gothic barbarity. Libraries were pillaged and destroyed with the same eagerness as the plate and money were seized and appropriated. The books and manuscripts, instead of being removed to some other foundation, and preserved in one of the cathedrals or universities, were often given away carelessly, or sold for trivial consideration, to the grantees of the abbeys. There was scarcely a religious house which had not a library, and many collections were extensive, and the books were of great value<sup>1</sup>. The art of printing, being then in its infancy, had secured but few books; and if the same ignorant and brutal rage against the monasteries had prevailed throughout Europe, which was excited in England, literature would have sustained a loss that could be neither calculated nor repaired. The monastic libraries were the repository of all the learning which was then cultivated, or which had descended from former ages. In the larger abbeys, persons were appointed to record the principal events which happened in the kingdom, and at the end of every year to digest them into annals. The Constitutions of the Clergy in their national and provincial synods,

<sup>1</sup> There were not less than seventeen hundred manuscripts in the library of Peterborough. The library of the Grey Friars, in London, built by Sir Richard Whittingdon, was 129 feet in length, and 31 feet in breadth, and well filled with books.....The great library at Wells had twenty-five windows on each side of it. Preface to Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, p. xxv.

together with the Acts of Parliament, were sent to the abbeys to be enrolled, and there also private families sent their hereditary documents to be preserved. Monastic records furnished Selden with his strongest evidences, for the right of dominion asserted by the Kings of England within the narrow seas. The loss of these libraries has left a chasm in our national history, which must ever be deplored, and which cannot be supplied<sup>m</sup>.

3. It was not a love of pure religion, it was not any hatred of popery and its superstitions, which occasioned the destruction of the English monasteries. The chief instigators, and the most active instruments in the work, were the avowed friends of the Church of Rome. It was sanctioned by Henry, who, whether supporting or renouncing the authority of the Pope, was throughout his life a doctrinal Romanist. It obtained the commendation of Gardiner, whose religious sentiments, as far as they can be known, were not less favourable to the Church of Rome than those of Henry. It was effected principally by London, who was notoriously guilty of those vices which he was so eager to detect and punish, and who was afterwards distinguished as a rancorous persecutor of the Protestants. With respect to the religious creed of Cromwell, it was at least dubious; his early education, under Wolsey, was in the Church of Rome, and his last declaration was, that he died in the Catholic faith. He was solicitous to expose the vices and superstitions of the religious houses, as a pretext which he knew would reconcile their destruction to many of the reformers.

4. The distribution of the monastic wealth was not less unjust than its rapacious seizure. Many modern families were enriched by the grant, or beneficial purchase, of the abbey lands; but many ancient families were deprived of

<sup>m</sup> “ Yea, I may say, that then holy Divinity was prophaned, Physic itself hurt, and a trespass, yea, a riot, committed on the Law itself.” Fuller’s Ch. Hist. b. vi. p. 436.

privileges derived from their ancestors, whose munificence had been applied to the foundation of religious houses. Not only were the abbeys a provision and an asylum for the younger branches of the nobility, and a place of education for all ranks, but the descendants of the founders had the privilege of corodies<sup>n</sup>, and the right of patronage. The noble family of Berkeley, by inheritance or marriage, enjoyed the patronage of not less than fifteen abbacies<sup>o</sup>, besides forty chantries. These rights were annihilated without equivalent or consideration.

5. The observations already offered affect not the general question of the utility of monastic institutions in relation to government and religion, and it may be safely pronounced that they had a pernicious influence on both. Under the feudal system, the monastic seignories formed an useful, and even a necessary, balance to the overgrown power of the temporal Barons. The cloistered sanctuary, which at last was abused to the concealment and security of crime, was originally a protection from lawless oppression and sanguinary revenge. Even the military orders, connected as they were with feudalism, operated as a corrective of its ferocity and injustice. It was not until the power of the English Barons had been broken by the policy of Henry the Seventh, that the abbeys could have been dissolved, without danger to the prerogatives of the Crown and the liberties of the people.

But when the feudal system was succeeded by a form of civil polity more favourable to moral and intellectual improvement, and consequently to the happiness of mankind, then the vices of the monastic character appeared in their full deformity: associated with feudalism, they derived some relief from contrast, but there was nothing in

<sup>n</sup> Corody, Corodium: money or allowance due to the King from a religious house, whereof he was founder, towards the sustentation of whomsoever he thought fit to bestow it on. Tomlin's Law Dict.

<sup>o</sup> Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. vi. p. 413.

a government of increased freedom with which they could harmonize. The privileges of an order of men, disengaged from all the ties of social life, and exempted from obedience to the laws, were then seen to be incompatible with the rights of the community.

The dissolution of the religious orders was a necessary result of the policy adopted by Henry the Seventh, though not the result intended by himself. It was the consequence of the change introduced by him into the English constitution, and it was also the consequence of the progress of religious reformation in the reign of Henry the Eighth.

6. If the monastic state be unfavourable to the enjoyment of political freedom, it is not less hostile to the advancement of pure Christianity. Viewed in the fairest light, it is a state in which, if some errors and vices may be avoided, many duties are rendered impracticable; it is a state which men may adopt, not from a love of virtue, but from a dread of sin. From the spirit of the Christian religion it is totally abhorrent, and it is hardly reconcileable with its precepts. Every season of human life has its appropriate duties, and requires a correspondent disposition of the mind :

*"Εργα νέων, βούλαι δὲ μέσων, εὐχαὶ δὲ γερόντων<sup>p</sup>.*

But the piety of old age is not to be confined within a cloister; it is not to be relegated from society more than the activity of youth or the discretion of manhood: blended with both, it produces a beautiful harmony, by giving a right direction to the energy of the young, and by refining and elevating the wisdom of maturé years. It thus connects human strength and human wisdom with their Divine Author, and teaches man to use them as the gifts of God.

<sup>p</sup> Let youth in deeds, in counsel man engage;  
Prayer is the proper duty of old age.

HESIOD. Carm. Fragm. Car. Goettling, p. 230. ed. 1831.

## CHAPTER VI.

Progress of the Reformation with respect to Doctrine.—Prelates divided.—Conduct of Cranmer.—Henry refuses to adopt the Confession of Augsburgh, and to join the Smalcadian League.—Translation of the Bible begun.—Formularies. 1. King's Primer; 2. Articles of Religion; 3. Institution of a Christian Man.—Translation of the Bible completed.—Divisions of the Clergy on the Sacraments and the Corporal Presence.—Disputation of Alesius, and of Lambert.—Statute of the Six Articles.

To consider the English Reformation in two distinct points of view,—first, as it affected the government, and, secondly, as it regarded the doctrines of the Church,—while it materially assists the perspicuity of the history, will scarcely disturb its chronological order. The papal jurisdiction had now been abolished, and one great branch of the Romish hierarchy had been destroyed, for the monastic orders were no more; but still the creed and the ritual of the Romish Church subsisted entire. In one of the statutes, which most strongly impugned the authority of the Pope, a declaration was inserted, that it was not intended to decline from the ancient faith as professed by the Catholic Church of Christendom <sup>a</sup>.

The proceedings of Henry in respect of the monasteries had kindled afresh the anger of the Pope, which the death of Catherine and the execution of Anne Boleyn <sup>1536</sup> had suppressed; and the fulminations of the vacillating Clement were directed with greater force by his successor Paul the Third; but no provocation from the Romish Pontiff could induce Henry to depart from what he considered the standard of orthodoxy. His love of theological knowledge was ardent, his attainments in theology were not contemptible; and these circumstances, joined with the pre-

<sup>a</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 21. s. xix.

judices of his education, prevented, throughout his reign, any progress in doctrinal reformation; it was generally stationary, and sometimes retrograde.

There were, doubtless, periods of his life when his religious opinions appeared to be under control. His successive Queens embraced opposite sentiments; and it would not be difficult to show, that his uncertain course in the work of reformation was sometimes guided by female influence. The predilection of Anne Boleyn for the Protestant cause is acknowledged, but it is probable that she was a Romanist in doctrine<sup>r</sup>; and though her death was deeply lamented by the reformers, yet it scarcely impeded the Reformation. Of far more importance, in guiding the religious opinions of Henry, were his two last Queens, Catherine Howard, and Catherine Parr. While the first enjoyed his favour, she had almost brought him to a retraction of all his previous measures; and while Catherine Parr softened the irritability of his declining years, she laboured not unsuccessfully to subdue his antipathy against the Protestant doctrines.

The Clergy of England, though unanimous in renouncing the authority of the Pope, were divided in the expediency of doctrinal reformation, and the numerical strength of the Bishops was on each side equal. On the side of the Protestants were Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury; Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; Shaxton, of Salisbury; Latimer, of Worcester; Fox, of Hereford; Hilsey, of Rochester; and Barlow, of St. David's. The Romanists could boast of Lee, Archbishop of York; Stokesley, Bishop of London; Tonstal, of Durham; Gardiner, of Winchester; Sherborne, of Chichester; Nix, of Norwich; and Kite, of Carlisle. These conflicting interests visibly discovered themselves in the

<sup>r</sup> She appears to have believed in the corporal presence. After her confinement in the Tower, she requested that a consecrated host might be placed in her closet. Lingard's History of England, vol. vi. c. iv. p. 312.

Upper House of Convocation, and in the Lower House their clerks and chaplains generally adhered to the party of their Lords and Patrons<sup>s</sup>.

After claiming an exception in behalf of Fox, whose support of the Reformation was distinguished by talent and temper, the assertion of Burnet must be admitted, that on Cranmer alone the task rested of sustaining the contest with the Romanists. The other Bishops who adhered to him impeded his designs. Latimer's simplicity and weakness provoked contempt<sup>t</sup>; Shaxton's contentiousness and pride excited hatred; and Barlow's ostentation raised disgust. The opponents of Cranmer, particularly Stokesley, Gardiner, and Tonstal, were not ordinary men; and it is much to say, what may be fairly said of him, that his abilities were fully equal to those by which he was encountered. To say that he was equal to the situation in which he was placed, could be scarcely said of any man. While his duties were of great variety and importance, the difficulties by which he was assailed were peculiar. If, therefore, he were on some points irresolute or temporizing, it should be remembered, that he was exposed to dangers which are appalling to humanity, and that the times in which he lived were unparalleled. Considering him in his relation to the Church, he had not only to fulfil the arduous duties of a pastor and chief governor, but he had to lay the foundation of the ecclesiastical polity of England<sup>u</sup>. He had not only to see that the Clergy maintained and taught "the form of sound doctrine," but he had to define and determine what "the form of sound doctrine" was. He had to decide some of

<sup>s</sup> Lord Herbert's Life of Henry VIII. Fuller's Church History, b. v. p. 138.

<sup>t</sup> This is taken from Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 512. See a juster estimate of Latimer's character in Blunt's Sketch of the Reformation, p. 279.

<sup>u</sup> See chap. viii. of this vol.

the most abstruse points of theology and metaphysics, and in their discussion was compelled to sustain the part both of a moderator and a disputant.

The question might be asked without irreverence, “ who is sufficient for these things?” And a consequent question occurs,—who could have been found more “ sufficient” than Cranmer? That he has been loaded with obloquy by the followers of the Church of Rome is no proof of his insufficiency; but an incontestable proof of his excellence is, that he commanded the respect of all descriptions of Protestants. He was honoured by the praise of men whose opinions were not only opposite to his own, but to each other; of men who proceeded not so far, or who went farther than himself, in separation from the discipline and tenets of the Romish Church. He preserved the esteem of Erasmus<sup>x</sup>, who died in its communion, although convinced of its errors; of Melancthon, who quitted it with timidity and reluctance; of Calvin, who renounced it with antipathy and detestation.

Before Cranmer had made a single attempt to reform the doctrines of the English Church, the Protestant Princes of the Germanic empire had made overtures for an alliance with the King of England. Such an alliance seemed desirable to both parties, and as the union was to be religious as well as political, an agreement was to be effected between the English and German divines. The celebrated Confession of Augsburgh was the acknowledged Creed of the foreign Protestants, and their theological leaders attempted with no small earnestness to introduce it into England. To effect this purpose, they employed

<sup>x</sup> Erasmus thus describes Cranmer: “ Professione theologus, vir integerrimus candidisque moribus. Qui ultro pollicitus est sese in studio ac beneficentiâ erga me priori nequaquam cessurum, et quod sponte pollicitus est, sponte præstare cœpit, ut mihi Waramus non eruptus, sed in Cranmero renatus videri queat.” Erasm. Ep. MCCLXI. vol. iii. Lugd. Bat. 1703.

all the fair arts of ingratiation and address. Melanethon dedicated his Commentary on the Epistles to the King of England, and Luther himself was prevailed on to offer an apology for the personal acrimony of his polemical attacks. The Germanic divines offered to send a deputation to England, that the points of difference between the English and foreign Protestant Churches might be discussed, and that such a discussion might lead to an union.

Henry, whose object was to form a political league, rather than to subscribe a religious confession, received the overtures of these divines with becoming respect, but with no disposition to accept them. When the divines of Wirtemburg ventured to insinuate that he had only removed some light abuses, while more grievous errors were retained, his reply was, that the King of England, knowing himself to be the most learned Prince in Europe, thought it a derogation to submit to them; he rather expected that they should submit to him.

The Princes and confederated states, who had formed the league of Smalcald, joined their invitations with those of the German divines, and offered certain conditions, on which they agreed to declare the King of England the "*Defensor and Protector*" of their league<sup>y</sup>. They required, that the King should encourage, promote, and maintain, the true doctrine of Christ as contained in the Augsburg Confession, unless by mutual assent any alterations might be made therein; that the King should defend the Augsburg Confession at the next General Council, if it were "pious, catholic, free, and Christian;" that neither of the contracting parties should allow of the intimation of a Council, or agree to the place, unless by joint consent; that if the Pope should persist in calling a Council without the agreement of the King and confederates, its decrees should not be respected within their respective dominions; that the primacy or monarchy of the Bishop of Rome

<sup>y</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. iii. no. 44.

should be formally and totally renounced; and that the King should advance one hundred thousand crowns immediately in support of the league, and double that sum hereafter, if required. With respect to the present contribution, they had asked only a moiety of the sum given by themselves; and although they had demanded a larger contribution in future, if there were a necessity, yet they agreed to refund a part even of the first payment, if it were not expended. They desired that the King would signify his intentions to the Landgrave of Hesse; and on learning them, the Princes would send their ambassadors, accompanied by some divine, to confer with the King concerning the articles of doctrine and the ceremonies of the Church.

To these demands the King sent two successive replies, the one before, and the other after, the death of Anne Boleyn<sup>z</sup>. In the first, he stated his intention to set forth the true doctrine of Christ, which he was ready to defend with his life; but that he being reckoned somewhat learned, and having many learned men in his kingdom, he could not think it meet to accept, at the hand of any creature, what should be the faith of himself or his realm, the only foundation of which was Scripture. He expressed his hope that they would not be grieved at this determination; but that they would send over some of their learned men, to confer with himself and the learned men of his own kingdom, to the intent that there might be between both a perfect union of faith. He would willingly join with them in all General Councils that were ‘catholic, free, and convened in a place safe for all parties<sup>a</sup>,’ for the defence of the true doctrine of the Gospel. As for ceremonies, there might be such a diversity used throughout the world, that he thought the order and limitation of them should be left to the governors of every nation, supposing that each of them can determine those

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. nos. 45 and 46.

<sup>a</sup> “Catholici, et liberi, in loco etiam omni parte tuto.” Ibid.

which are most commodious for his own dominions. He agreed, that neither they nor himself should accept the constitutions of a General Council, but by mutual consent; but that if such a Council were assembled in a safe place, it should not be refused. The King did not think fit to accept the title and situation offered to him, till there should be an entire agreement upon the articles of doctrine; but those being once adjusted, he would thankfully accept the same. There was a secret article, that the King should pay a proportion of expenses already incurred by the confederates, a proposition which he thought "very strange and somewhat unreasonable;" but in future he was willing to contribute according to the proportion specified by themselves.

After a deliberate consideration, and under different circumstances, Henry transmitted his second answer. It began with the warmest expressions of regard for their virtues, and of gratitude for their benevolent disposition towards himself, and expressed his wish of continuing a friendly correspondence on the subject of religion. "His wish for a reformation was not less strong than in time past, and at present he was not moved by any 'private necessity,' that either himself or his realm could have, to join in a league with the confederates. He and his kingdom were now in perfect peace: by the death of a woman [Anne Boleyn] all calumnies were extinguished, so that neither the Bishop of Rome, nor the Emperor, nor any other Prince, had any quarrel with him. That the confederates might be assured of his good affection to themselves, to the reformation of the Church, and abolition of abuses, he still offered his former contribution for the defence of the league. On condition of an agreement in articles of faith, he was still willing to accept the title of protector and defender of their religion. In return for these concessions on his part, he required that, in case his dominions were invaded, the confederates should furnish

him with a stated number of men and ships; and that, in all Councils, they would promote and defend the opinion which several Protestant divines<sup>b</sup> had expressed on the subject of his marriage."

In this manner the negociation between Henry and the confederates of the Smalcaldian league terminated, with mutual protestations of friendship and esteem, and with a contribution of a small sum from the English Monarch. But the intercourse was prolonged with the divines of the Augsбург Confession, and a deputation, according to the original proposal, was sent to England.

Of Melanthon Henry had always expressed the highest admiration, and had frequently invited this eminent reformer into his dominions; but Melanthon was engaged by more indispensable avocations, and was unable to join the deputation. The divines who were sent remained in England several months, and were treated by Henry with civility, and by Cromwell and Cranmer with kindness; but they returned without settling any of their theological differences. When they were dismissed, Henry sent to the Elector of Saxony his assurances of esteem: he doubted not that good effects would follow even from this beginning of a conference; but the matters in debate, being of the highest moment, ought to be maturely considered. He again requested that Melanthon might be sent over to him, and declared his intention of applying himself wholly to those studies which it became a Christian Prince to pursue.

While these fruitless negotiations were carrying on to engage Henry in an union with the Smalcaldian league, founded on the basis of the Augsбург Confession, Cranmer was steadily pursuing his great object. No man was more intimately acquainted with the sentiments of the foreign reformers, no man more willingly acknowledged their high

<sup>b</sup> Dr. Martin (meaning Luther), Justus Jonas, Cruciger, Pomeran, and Melanthon.

merits, yet no man was more sensible of their errors<sup>c</sup>. In the promotion of his designs, he was not disposed to render an implicit submission to their authority. An union with the foreign Protestant Churches was with him a subordinate consideration : his first wish was, that “the Church of England might be free.” [Magna Charta.]

This principle, unmoveably fixed in his mind, was sufficient to preserve him from enthusiastic or latitudinarian errors. He was convinced that religious liberty must be founded on obedience to the word of God, and that, in order to be free, the Church of England must be scriptural. It ought to be recorded with pious gratitude, that the first object which engaged his attention, after his elevation, was an authorized translation of THE BIBLE into the English language.

The translations of the Holy Scriptures, which had been hitherto made, were suppressed as far as possible by ecclesiastical censures and temporal penalties. The written copies of Wiclid's translation had been condemned as heretical<sup>d</sup>, and those who read them were liable to the punishment inflicted on heretics. When the first printed version of the New Testament by Tindal appeared, Wolsey and the other Bishops prohibited its use; and Tonstal, then Bishop of London, with Sir Thomas More, bought almost the whole impression, and burnt it at St. Paul's Cross<sup>e</sup>. The author, not dismayed, continued his labours: with the assistance of Miles Coverdale he translated the Pentateuch, and to each of the books prefixed a prologue severely animadverting on the Bishops and the Clergy. The work was dispersed through England, and was eagerly read, but

<sup>c</sup> “I have seen in some of his letters to Osiander, and some of Osiander's to him, he very much disliked the violence of the German divines.” Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. ii. p. 348.

<sup>d</sup> In a Convocation of the Clergy at Oxford, held under Archbishop Arundel. Lynwode, lib. v. de Hereticis, fol. ccxvii.

<sup>e</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. p. ii. b. i. p. 61.

the extraneous matter of the prologues was not calculated to soften the dislike of the Clergy against translations in general. A decree of the Star Chamber condemned the venders of Tindal's translation to burn the books which they had themselves dispersed, at the Standard in Cheapside, and amerced them in a considerable fine. Tindal, in defiance of prohibitions and proclamations, proceeded with his translation; but his prefaces and prologues so highly incensed Henry, that he was seized in Flanders, where he was afterwards burnt, praying, in his last moments, that God would open the eyes of the King of England.

When the jurisdiction of the Pope had been legally abolished, and an English Convocation, disowning the authority of the Romish See, had assembled under the presidency of its Metropolitan, it was strenuously urged, that if the translation of Tindal were false and heretical, a new version should be made. This proposition, moved by Cranmer, and supported by Fox, was opposed by Gardiner, now at the head of the doctrinal Romanists. He asserted, that all the heresies and extravagant opinions, at this time current in Germany, and thence brought into England, originated in an unrestricted use of the Scriptures. To offer the whole Bible in the English tongue to the nation at large, during the existing distractions, was a measure full of danger. He therefore proposed that a short exposition of the most useful and necessary doctrines of the Christian faith should be composed for the use of the people, since this was the only way to keep them in obedience to the King and the Church in matters of faith.

The friends of reformation were not unwilling that such an exposition should be set forth, but contended that it was not sufficient. They maintained, that the people should be allowed to 'search the Scriptures;' that they might be convinced of the conformity of the proposed exposition to the divine word. They adduced an argument

of a different kind, and of greater weight, that nothing could so effectually subvert the papal supremacy as a free circulation of the Bible, for there, all the extravagant pretensions of the Pope were proved to be groundless.

These arguments made their due impression, not only on the Convocation but the King, and the translation was sanctioned and commanded by the supreme authority. Cranmer began with the New Testament, assigning a portion of the translation to be revised by each Bishop. The Acts of the Apostles were allotted to Stokesley; but his answer was, that he wondered at the imprudence of the Archbishop in thus infecting the people with heresy; that he had not yet looked into his portion, and that he never would. This refusal on the part of Stokesley appears to have considerably retarded the accomplishment of the work<sup>f</sup>.

During the time that Cranmer and those Prelates who promoted his views were engaged in completing a translation of the Scriptures, those popular expositions of the Christian faith, recommended by the Convocation, successively appeared. The earliest was the PRIMER, a tract drawn up by a single hand<sup>g</sup>, but edited by the King's authority. A prefatory admonition to the reader complained of several books calculated to mislead the people in their application to the Saints, and to set God and His creatures on the same level. Though many divines had made a speculative distinction between Latria and Dulia<sup>h</sup>, and appropriated the first only to God, yet in practice this distinction was too often forgotten. The Primer itself consisted of an exposition of the Ten Commandments and the Creed, succeeded by a paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer. After this followed the salutation of the Virgin,

<sup>f</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. i. chap. viii. p. 48.

<sup>g</sup> It was the work of Cuthbert Marshal, Archdeacon of Nottingham. Strype's Eccles. Mem. vol. i. c. 31. p. 335.

<sup>h</sup> λατρεία—‘service of God.’ Plat. Ap. δουλεία—‘servitude.’

the seven penitential Psalms, and a Litany. The book was concluded by some prayers and other hymns.

In the next year after the publication of the Primer, a summary of the doctrine of the English Church was promulgated, and comprised in the form of ARTICLES. The Primer was intended only for the use of the young and uneducated, but the Articles were intended as a national confession of faith. These Articles were not agreed on without a long debate, occasioned by the great diversities of opinion which prevailed in the two Houses of Convocation. The Lower House had drawn up a collection<sup>1</sup> of those opinions which were deemed erroneous and heretical, but which were maintained by the Reformers. The censure of the Lower House was aimed particularly at Cranmer, but it had not the effect intended. The King commanded his Vicegerent, Cromwell, to lay before the Convocation certain Articles which he had himself devised, and to require the assent of the Clergy. It was stated, that the design of the Articles was to establish quietness and unity; and as there were contained in them propositions favourable both to the Romanists and the Reformers, they were subscribed by the contending parties. They were then signed by the King, and enforced by a royal declaration.

As this was the first Confession of the English Church after its first separation from Rome, a brief abstract of these Articles is necessary to show the progress of the reformed doctrines.

First, The people were to be instructed by the Bishops and preachers to believe and defend "the whole body and canon of the Bible," and the three Creeds. All heresies contrary to these were condemned, and also all opinions contrary to the four first General Councils.

Secondly, Concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, the people were to be instructed that it was instituted by Christ for the remission of sins, without which none could attain

<sup>1</sup> Fifty-nine in number. Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. ii. p. 336.

everlasting life. Not only those of full age, but infants may, and must be, baptized for the pardon of original sin, and obtaining the gift of the Holy Ghost, by which they become sons of God. Those of riper years, who desire Baptism, must join with it repentance and faith. The opinions of the Anabaptists and Pelagians are condemned as detestable heresies. . . .

Thirdly, Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, it was declared to be instituted of Christ, and to be absolutely necessary to salvation. Penance was defined to be a compound of contrition, confession, and amendment of life, with outward works of charity, which were its necessary fruits. Contrition was described to be an inward shame and sorrow for sin, because of its offensiveness to God. Faith being the application of the promises of God, was manifested by confession, and this must be made to a priest, if possible : for the absolution given by a priest was instituted by Christ, to apply the promise of God's grace and favour to the penitent. Auricular confession was not to be condemned, but all were to use it for the benefit of their consciences. As to amendment of life, with its consequent fruits, though Christ and His death be the only sufficient oblation and sacrifice, yet all men must bring forth fruits worthy of penance. By so doing, they will not only obtain everlasting life, but a mitigation of worldly pains and affliction.

Fourthly, Concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, it was taught that, under the forms of bread and wine, there was truly and substantially contained and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the Cross for man's redemption ; therefore it was to be received with all due reverence, every man having first tried and examined himself according to the direction of Saint Paul.

Fifthly, Justification was defined to be a remission of sins and reconciliation with God; that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ. For the attainment of Justifica-

tion, contrition, faith, and charity are necessary, which qualities must both concur in it, and also follow it. The good works necessary to salvation are not only outward works, but the inward spiritual motions and graces of the Holy Spirit.

The other Articles related to the Rites and laudable ceremonies of the Church. Of images, while it was acknowledged that on account of their abuses they were absolutely forbidden in the Old Testament, yet, according to the testimony of the best authors, they were allowed in the New Testament. They were of use to represent "virtue and good example," and to excite devotion, therefore it was expedient that they should still remain in churches. But that the people might not fall into their old superstitions, they were to be cautioned against the abuses of image-worship, and to be taught that censing, kneeling, or making oblations before these images, were acts done not to them, but to the honour of God.

Concerning the honouring of Saints, it was taught that they, being in heaven with Christ, ought to be honoured by Christian people upon earth, but not with that confidence and honour which are due to God only. We must not think to obtain from the hand of Saints those blessings which are obtained only of God: as for praying to them, it was incumbent, in order that they might pray for and with us. The days appointed by the Church in honour of their memories ought still to be observed, unless the supreme head of the Church should hereafter mitigate or moderate them.

The Rites and Ceremonies of the Church were not to be condemned and rejected, but were to be retained as good and laudable; since they had mystical significations in them, and were useful in leading the mind to God. Such were the vestments ordinarily used in the celebration of divine worship; the sprinkling of holy water to put us in mind of our baptism, and of the blood of Christ sprinkled

for our redemption on the cross; the distribution of holy bread, to remind us of the Sacrament of the Altar; bearing candles on Candlemas-day in memory of Christ, the spiritual Light of the world; sprinkling ashes on Ash-Wednesday; bearing palms on Palm-Sunday; creeping to the cross on Good-Friday, and setting up the sepulchre on that day; hallowing the font; and similar exorcisms and benedictions.

With respect to the doctrine of Purgatory, it was declared a good and charitable deed to pray for the dead, a custom which had continued in the Church from the primitive times. It was the duty of a Christian to pray for souls departed, to commit them in his own prayers to the mercy of God, to cause others to pray by instituting masses and exequies, and to give alms for that purpose. By these prayers of charitable Christians, departed souls may "sooner obtain the mercy of God, and the fruition of His glory." But since the place in which they were, and the pains which they suffered, were not clearly revealed in Scripture, we ought to remit and commend them to the mercy of God: therefore all those abuses which had been advanced under the pretence of purgatory ought to be done away; such as, that pardons from the Bishop of Rome could deliver souls out of their pains, or that masses said before any image, or in any particular place, were effectual.

These Articles having been submitted to the King, and in many parts corrected with his own hand, were signed by Cromwell as Vicegerent, by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, by seventeen Bishops, and by forty Abbots and Priors of the Upper House of Convocation, and also by fifty Archdeacons and Proctors of the Lower House. Having been thus signed, they were again presented to the King, and after receiving his confirmation, were published in his name, and by his authority. The prefatory declaration stated, that the King, observing with regret a

great diversity of opinion among his subjects about articles of faith and ceremonies, had in his own person applied himself to the study of these points. He required his people gratefully to accept these Articles; praying God so to illuminate their hearts, that they might have no less zeal and love to unity in reading, than he had in devising and setting forth, this standard of sound doctrine. If his present endeavours met a good acceptance, he should be encouraged to continue his labours in such a manner as might conduce to the honour of God, as well as to the advantage and tranquillity of his subjects<sup>j</sup>.

When these Articles were published, they were received with greater pleasure by the Reformers than by the Romantics. The former were rejoiced to see so rapid an advance already made, and were encouraged to hope for other and still more important changes. The Scriptures and the three Creeds were laid down as the standard of faith, without mentioning tradition, or the decrees of the Church. In the next place, the foundation of the Christian faith was truly stated, and the terms of the covenant between God and man were rightly defined, without entering into any scholastic subtleties. The worship of saints and images, though not removed, was palliated, and purgatory was declared to be uncertain. If some superstitious doctrines and ceremonies were retained, the royal declaration promised that they might hereafter be softened or done away. Four Sacraments out of seven were entirely omitted.

The more prudent and moderate of the foreign Protestants acknowledged the pacific spirit and beneficial tendency of these Articles. So highly were they approved by the Emperor and the more learned divines of Germany, that they formed the basis of that system of doctrine called "the Interim;" because it contained temporary

<sup>j</sup> Bishop Lloyd's Formularies, p. 5. Collier's Eccl. Hist. part ii. b. ii. p. 343.

regulations, which were to continue no longer in force than until the meeting of a free General Council<sup>k</sup>.

To confer greater credit and authority on this Confession of faith, Injunctions were published by Cromwell in the name of the King. In these, every ecclesiastical Incumbent was commanded to instruct his congregation, four times in a year, that the Bishop of Rome had no authority in England; to set forth the Articles lately sanctioned by Convocation; and, at the same time, to distinguish those which were Articles of faith from those which were merely rules for the decent and politic order of the Church. Images or reliques, either for superstition or gain, were no longer to be extolled, neither were pilgrimages to be recommended; but in their room were to be enforced the moral commands of God, and works of charity. The people were to be exhorted to teach their children the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Commandments, in English, and their pastors were to explain a portion of them daily. Among other regulations, every beneficed person who did not reside was required to distribute among the poor of his parish one fortieth part of the revenues of his benefice; every Incumbent, whose annual income amounted to one hundred pounds, was obliged to maintain an Exhibitioner at a Public School, or at one of the Universities; and this Exhibitioner, after the completion of his studies, was to be the coadjutor of the Incumbent in the duties of his cure.

Besides the Primer and the Articles, the Bishops and Clergy, friendly to the Reformation, prevailed with the King to set forth a more copious exposition of the Christian religion. This remarkable book was entitled, "THE INSTITUTION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN," and had been drawn up by the order of Convocation three years before its publication<sup>l</sup>. It contained an explanation of the common

<sup>k</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 438.

<sup>l</sup> Bishop Lloyd's

Formularies. The Institution was sometimes called the Bishop's Book.

Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the salutation of the Virgin, with two Articles on Justification and Purgatory. Its object, as stated in the preface, was "to set forth a plain and sincere doctrine, containing the whole sum of all those things which appertain unto the profession of a Christian man." The former Articles were illustrated in it, with large additions on the Seven Sacraments, and the Articles of Justification and Purgatory. It seems to have been the aim of "the Institution," as well as of "the Articles," to conciliate the Reformers and the doctrinal Romanists; and as it received the signature of twenty-one Prelates, and twenty-five other divines, of both parties, it is probable that each party conceded to the other some of its leading opinions. The corporal presence in the Sacrament of the Altar was asserted, without affirming that the substance of bread and wine was destroyed. The Sacrament was to be received with reverence and honour, without mentioning adoration.

The most extended exposition relates to the Sacrament of Orders. The sacerdotal office is distinguished from the civil government of Kings and Princes, and is said to be instituted by Christ Himself. It is called in some places the power of the keys, and is distinct from the power of the sword. It consists of two parts: the one of instruction, and the other of government. This ordinance of teaching and governing the Church was committed by Christ to different orders, and divided into distinct offices, and it is still necessary to be retained. It was committed and given by Christ and His Apostles to Priests or Bishops, whom they first elected, and then admitted by imposition of hands. With strict truth it may be called a Sacrament, because it consists of two parts; of a spiritual and inward grace, and of an outward and a visible sign.

The authority of the Priesthood is divided into two branches; the power of order, and the power of jurisdiction.

Concerning the first, as it is undisputed, nothing is said; but the second is subdivided into three parts; the power of censure and excommunication; the power of ordination and perpetuating the hierarchy; and the power of making ecclesiastical laws.

In the sequel of the exposition, the supremacy of the Pope is shown to be an usurpation unknown in the primitive ages. There was no disparity in the apostolical character, for all the Apostles were on an equality with respect to authority and jurisdiction. The authority of metropolitans and patriarchs was only a regulation conducive to the good government of the Church, but was not of divine institution. Two orders alone of the sacerdotal office are mentioned, those of Bishops and Priests.

Thus far the Reformation had proceeded without any schism among the Clergy, and without any opposition on the part of the King. Cromwell had gained an ascendant over the mind of Henry far beyond any minister, except Wolsey, and by his address carried into execution many of those excellent designs which Cranmer had projected in retirement.

The Archbishop, after surmounting many difficulties, completed that great work which had long engaged his attention, the Translation of the Bible. It was presented by Cromwell to the King, and a licence was obtained for all the King's subjects to read it without control or danger. The exertions of Cromwell called forth from the Primate the warmest acknowledgments, and the most lively expressions of joy. He returned thanks to God, that he had lived to see the dawn of reformation which was now risen on England, since the light of God's word did shine over it without a cloud. Injunctions were issued in the name of the King, that all Incumbents should provide one of these Bibles, and set it up publicly in their churches. They were not to discourage or hinder any from reading it, but, on the contrary, to recommend its diligent perusal.

A caution was subjoined not to raise disputes concerning the exposition of any difficult place, but to refer it to men of higher judgment in the Scriptures<sup>m</sup>.

The cause of the Reformers might now be called triumphant; but it was unfortunately vulnerable in one point, and there the doctrinal Romanists skilfully directed their attacks. This was the corporal presence, a doctrine maintained in a qualified sense by the foreign Protestant Churches, and in the strictest sense by the English Church. It was a doctrine devoutly believed by the King, and distinctly asserted in the late formularies prepared by the Convocation. Though it was the first of the Romish corruptions which Wiclif had attacked nearly two centuries before, yet it was the last which the reformed Church of England abandoned. It is certain, that there were many sectarists who denied that any change was produced in the elements of bread and wine by the act of consecration; but they were stigmatized by the name of Sacramentarians, and were considered as heretics, not less by the Lutherans than by the Romanists.

Against this heresy Gardiner artfully directed the attention of the King; representing, that nothing could secure the Church more effectually against a relapse under the tyranny of the Pope than a vigorous persecution of the Sacramentarians. The insidious suggestion would thus be completely refuted, that a separation from the pale of the Church of Rome was followed by the most pernicious errors in faith and practice.

Gardiner was undoubtedly sincere in his belief of the corporal presence, and held it to be an essential part of Christianity; but it is a reasonable supposition, that he saw the Reformers inclined to depart from the doctrine, and, seeing their inclination, determined to counteract it by appealing to the prejudices of Henry. That Cranmer at this time inclined to the Lutheran doctrine of consub-

<sup>m</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. iii. nos. xi. xii.

stantiation has been asserted on no light presumptions; and, that he wavered on the capital and distinguishing tenet of the Romish Church, may be inferred from his recorded declarations <sup>a</sup>.

The nature and number of the Sacraments had been debated in an assembly of Bishops, before the “Institution of a Christian Man” was published by authority. 1537 Cromwell, by the royal command, had declared in Convocation, that the rites and ceremonies of the Church should be reformed by the rules of Scripture, and, that these rites and ceremonies might be fairly discussed, introduced to the assembled Bishops a Scottish divine named Alesius <sup>b</sup>. From the proemium of Cromwell, it appeared, not only that the place of meeting, but that the subject of disputation, had been previously arranged. The question to be debated was that of the seven Sacraments; and while Stokesley endeavoured to show that they were of divine institution, by the authority of the Schoolmen, Cranmer, supported by Fox, boldly appealed to the Scriptures. The reasoning of Fox would be inadequately expressed in any other language than his own: “We be commanded by the King that these controversies should be determined only by the rule and judgment of Scripture. Think not that we can by any sophistical subtleties steal out of the world again that light which every man doth see. Christ hath so lightened the world at this time, that the light of the Gospel hath put to flight all misty darkness, and it will

<sup>a</sup> Wordsworth, Eccles. Biog. vol. iii. p. 502.

<sup>b</sup> Alexander Alesse, or Hales. He had lived much with the German divines, particularly Melancthon, and was invited into England by Cromwell and Cranmer, and even by the King himself. He read lectures on divinity at Cambridge; but meeting with opposition there, he returned to London, and applied himself to the study of medicine. See *Acts and Mon.* by John Foxe, vol. ii. p. 424. There was a tract, giving an account of the conference, by Alesse, which supplied Foxe with his materials.

shortly have the higher hand of all clouds, though we resist never so much. The laity do now know the Scripture better than many of us; and the Germans have made the text of the Bible so plain and easy by the Hebrew and Greek tongues, that now many things may be better considered without any glosses at all, than with all the commentaries of the doctors." He warned the assembly against the supposition, that the authority of the Pope was sufficient to extinguish that which was commonly called heresy, and thus concluded his eloquent harangue: "Truth is the daughter of time, and time is the mother of truth; and whatsoever is besieged of truth cannot long continue; and upon whose side truth doth stand, that ought not to be thought transitory, or that it will ever fall."

An important inference may be drawn from this disputation; that although the seven Sacraments had been maintained in the "Institution," yet the private sentiments of the Reformers were in favour of this Protestant doctrine, that the only two Sacraments of divine institution were those of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Still there was no evidence that any of the English Prelates, who favoured the Reformation, proceeded so far as to deny the doctrine of the corporal presence. An occasion, however, soon presented itself, by which the strength of their belief on this article was brought to the test, and this happened at the trial, or rather the disputation, of Lambert, otherwise called John Nicholson, a noted Sacramentarian.

This individual, in his earlier days, had filled the situation of Chaplain to the English factory at Antwerp; but, by the advice of Sir Thomas More, had been dismissed on account of his heretical opinions. Leaving Germany, he came to his native country, and relinquishing his ministerial functions, had long been employed in the care of a school at London. He might

have continued his employment in quietness, if he had not been induced to engage in theological controversy. Having been present at a sermon delivered by Taylor, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, on the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, Lambert, in a private interview, offered some reasons for his disbelief in the doctrine of the preacher, and these arguments he subsequently digested in the form of a treatise. This tract was first shown to Barnes, a Lutheran, and, as such, a violent persecutor of the Sacramentarians, and then was read by Cranmer and Latimer. These two Prelates vainly laboured to convince Lambert, for, instead of a retraction, he adopted the fatal resolution of appealing to the King.

This appeal the King was persuaded by Gardiner to accept, and to determine the question in a public and solemn manner. He thought such an opportunity for the display of his theological learning too favourable to be lost, and signified his intention, not only of presiding at the trial, but of conducting some part of the disputation. A day was appointed for this extraordinary proceeding, when there was a large assemblage in Westminster-Hall of the Bishops and Clergy, the Nobility, the Judges, the King's counsel, and an incredible number of spectators.

When the prisoner was brought to the bar on a charge of heresy, the proceedings were opened by a speech from Dayes, one of the King's counsel, stating that the assembly was not convened to dispute concerning any point of faith, but in order that the King, as supreme head and defender of the Church, might, in the presence of his subjects, convince the prisoner of his errors. Henry then commanded Lambert to declare his opinion on the Sacrament of the Altar.

Lambert began his reply with an acknowledgment of the King's benevolent condescension in thus hearing the causes of his subjects, and added many high commendations of his judgment and learning. But Henry with a

stern voice interrupted this encomiastic preface, and informed his trembling panegyrist, that he came not there to hear his own praises. Lambert was therefore commanded at once to give an answer to the question, “Whether Christ’s Body was in the Sacrament or not?” The prisoner having replied, in the words of Augustin, that His Body was there in a certain manner, this was not received as an answer sufficiently explicit; and the question having been again asked, Lambert was under the necessity of giving a direct negative, that it was not the Body of Christ.

The King having urged the literal sense of the passage, “This is my Body,” commanded the Archbishop of Canterbury to proceed in the disputation, and to confute Lambert’s proposition. Cranmer confined his argument to combating the impossibility of a body being in two places at the same time: this he attempted to show was possible, from the appearance of Christ to Saint Paul; Christ was always in heaven, and yet was seen by Saint Paul in the air. To this argument Lambert objected, that Christ was then in heaven, and in heaven alone, and that Saint Paul heard a voice, and saw a vision, but not the very Body of Christ. The argument of Cranmer was reconcileable with his belief in the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation; and Gardiner, thinking that he had managed the disputation feebly and unskilfully, interposed in the debate.

The arguments of Tonstal turned upon the omnipotence of God; that it was not to be limited by any appearance of difficulty; that human faculties being weak and finite, our notions of impossibilities were proportioned to our faculties. Stokesley by a bold illustration thought at once to terminate the disputation: he showed, that in nature one substance is changed into another, and yet the accidents remain. When water is boiled till it evaporates in air, one substance is changed into another; but the original accident, moisture, remains, air as well as water being

moist. This argument was received with plaudits, but whether of approbation or derision is uncertain.

The disputation continued during five hours, and all accounts agree that Lambert was at length silenced, and had nothing more to urge. Without assenting to the interpretation given to his silence, that he was vanquished in argument, the peculiarity of his situation was sufficient to overwhelm him with confusion. The field of disputation was a court of criminal judicature; whether vanquished or victorious, he was obnoxious to the penalties of heresy; he had a variety of opponents, and at their head the supreme dispenser of the law. The silence and disorder of Lambert occasioned a general acclamation through the Hall, and the victory of the King was proclaimed by the shouts of the multitude. While the prisoner was thus silent, the King asked him whether he was convinced, and whether he chose to live or die? His answer was not that of a foiled disputant awed by the superior skill of his antagonist, but that of a martyr prepared to die for the sake of conscience. He refused to recant, but committed his soul to God, and his body to the clemency of the King. The royal clemency without a recantation could not be expected. Cromwell was commanded to pronounce the sentence of the law against him as an incorrigible heretic, and he was condemned to be burnt: this punishment he endured with remarkable constancy, though his torments were protracted and excruciating<sup>p</sup>.

Gardiner, and the advocates of Transubstantiation, were careful to improve this victory over Lambert: they flattered Henry with the reputation which he had acquired by the late display of his polemical talents; they reminded him of his youthful achievements in the cause of orthodoxy, and that he had again proved himself worthy of his title of defender of the faith. If Henry were on any side open to flattery, it was on his skill in divinity, and he readily

<sup>p</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 505.

concurred in the advice of his counsellors to summon a Parliament. A law might then be enacted for punishing the heretical opinions which were spreading, both on the Sacraments, and on the other articles of the Christian faith.

A Parliament was accordingly summoned, and soon after its meeting the Lord Chancellor informed the House of Lords, that the King, being desirous of uniting 1539 his subjects in religious opinion, had commanded the proposition to be communicated of appointing a Committee for drawing up some Articles of agreement, which might be reported and taken into consideration by the whole House. To this proposition the Lords assented, and nominated Cromwell the Vicegerent, the two Archbishops, with the Bishops of Durham, Bath and Wells, Ely, Bangor, Carlisle, and Worcester. It was not probable that a committee composed of such discordant elements could agree on any Articles, and eleven days were consumed in unprofitable debate. At the expiration of that time, the Duke of Norfolk acquainted the House that the Committee had made no progress; he therefore undertook to submit to their consideration certain Articles in the form of questions.

1. Whether, in the Eucharist, Christ's real Body was present without any Transubstantiation?
2. Whether that Sacrament was to be given in both kinds?
3. Whether the vows of chastity made either by men or women ought to be observed by the law of God?
4. Whether by the law of God private masses ought to be celebrated?
5. Whether by the law of God Priests might marry?
6. Whether auricular confession was necessary by the law of God?

After these Articles had been duly considered by the House, a Bill was ordered to be framed in correspondence with the sense of the majority, inflicting penalties on such as offended against its provisions. In the debate which took place on this occasion, Cranmer was preeminently

distinguished, and on three successive days argued against the introduction of the Bill. On the first Article he said little, because, so that the corporal presence was admitted, its framers were contented to leave the matter undetermined; and Cranmer, whether his belief on this point were Lutheran or not, was certainly at this period no Sacramentarian. On the second he argued affirmatively, both from the words of Christ's institution, and the practice of the Church for twelve centuries. Against the third and fourth Articles he spoke with great force. The Bill for the suppression of the greater monasteries had, in this Session, been unfairly impelled through Parliament by the strength of the prerogative; and he contended, that it was an act of the greatest cruelty to turn monastics on the wide world, and still to assert that their vows of chastity were binding. The Parliament had absolved them from their two other vows of poverty and obedience, and it was extremely unreasonable to absolve them from these, while one was still to remain in force of almost impracticable possibility. To assert the necessity of private masses was a condemnation of the King's proceedings, in suppressing so many religious houses founded for that purpose. On that Article which concerned the marriage of Priests he was deeply interested, for he had taken as his second wife the niece of Osiander, the celebrated German reformer: he showed that the prohibition of marriage to the Clergy was founded only on the papal constitutions; and as the authority which enacted these constitutions was abolished in England, it was absurd that the prohibition should continue.

The Bishops of Ely, Salisbury, Worcester, Rochester, and Saint David's, took the side of the Archbishop of Canterbury. On the other side were the Archbishop of York, with the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, London, Chichester, Norwich, and Carlisle. The temporal Peers,

with the exception of Cromwell, if he could then be called a Peer, were unanimous against the reforming Prelates.

After a short prorogation the House again met, and the Lord Chancellor announced, that not only the spiritual Lords, but the King himself, had taken great pains to effect an agreement: therefore he moved, in the King's name, that a Bill might be brought in for punishing offenders against the six Articles lately proposed to the House. The Lords then ordered two different Bills to be prepared: one by the direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Ely and Saint David's; another by the Archbishop of York, with the Bishops of Durham and Winchester. The Bill drawn up by the Archbishop of York was preferred, and after a long contest was carried through the House. When the Bill was about to pass, the King gave permission to the Archbishop of Canterbury to leave the House, since he could not give his consent to it; but the Primate humbly excused himself, since he thought his duty obliged him to resist it even in its last stage. It was sent down to the House of Commons, where it was passed without opposition, and soon was confirmed by the royal assent<sup>q</sup>.

The title of the Act was, "for abolishing diversity of opinions concerning the Christian religion." The preamble stated, that the King, considering the blessed effects of union and the mischiefs of discord, had called a Parliament and a Convocation at the same time. The King himself had come in person to the Parliament and Council, and "opened many things of high learning and great knowledge;" he had therefore agreed with the two Houses on six Articles, which were recited at length.

The enactments were to the following effect: that whoever should write, preach, or dispute against the first Article, in which transubstantiation was distinctly asserted,

<sup>q</sup> Collier's Eccl. Hist. part ii. b. iii. p. 37.

should be adjudged an heretic, and burnt without benefit of abjuration, and his goods should be forfeited ; that whoever declared against the other five Articles, either by writing or otherwise, should be adjudged guilty of felony, and suffer death without benefit of Clergy. All previous marriages of Priests were declared void, and if any Priest still cohabited with a woman whom he had formerly married, he was adjudged guilty of felony. Unchastity in any Priest was punishable with imprisonment and forfeiture of goods for the first offence, and with death for the second ; and the women were liable to the same penalties as the Priests. Those who contemned, or wilfully abstained from, confession or the sacraments at the accustomed times, were liable to similar penalties.

For the due execution of the Act, commissions were to be issued to all Archbishops and Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, and such other persons in every county as the King should name. The Commissioners were to hold their sittings quarterly, or oftener, and the process was to be by presentment and a trial by jury. All Ecclesiastical Incumbents were bound to read the Act in their churches four times in a year. A proviso was added concerning vows of chastity ; that they should not be binding, unless they had been taken at the age of twenty-one years, and had been taken without compulsion<sup>r</sup>.

This sanguinary Act, called the *six-stringed whip*, confirmed the temporary triumph of Gardiner and his party over the friends of the Reformation. Though the papal jurisdiction had been abolished, yet the people were now oppressed by a yoke more galling. The monasteries were dissolved, and their wealth dissipated ; but the superstitions which were assigned as a reason for their dissolution were established by law. Offences against any particular Article were not equally dangerous, only because they were not equally palpable. The denial of the corporal

<sup>r</sup> Stat. 31 Henry VIII. c. 14.

presence was the offence most difficult of conviction, and that of marriage the most easy.

The feeling of the reforming Prelates was most strongly expressed by the resignation of Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury, and Latimer, Bishop of Worcester. The latter, on his return from the Parliament house, after resigning his Bishopric, threw aside his rochet, and, with that air of gaiety which accompanied his most serious actions and his most painful trials, sprang from the ground, and declared that he had never before felt himself so light\*.

## CHAPTER VII.

Friendship of Henry towards Cranmer.—Persecution of the Reformers.—Bible reprinted, with a Preface by Cranmer.—Promotion of Boner, and his cooperation in the Reformation.—Speech of Cromwell to the Parliament, and his fall.—Office of Ecclesiastical Vicegerent abolished.—Committee for revising the Ceremonies of the Church, and an Account of the *Rationale*.—Committee for setting forth an Exposition of Christian Doctrine, and an Account of the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition*.—Last Years of Henry the Eighth.

THE Statute of the six Articles was a striking proof that the political influence of Cranmer had declined, but his personal estimation with his Sovereign suffered no diminution. Remorseless and capricious as Henry was to others, yet to Cranmer he was indulgent and constant. The Primate, with no other protection than candour and unsuspecting simplicity, found in the friendship of his master a security against the violence and intrigues of a party at all times formidable, but now armed with the weapons of annoyance. His inflexible resistance against the late Statute, so contrary to the natural facility of his temper, commanded the respect even of a despotic

\* Acts and Mon. vol. iii. p. 385.

monarch. At the prorogation of the Parliament, he received a summons from the King, who, having heard of the ability with which he had spoken in the late debate, commanded him to digest his arguments in a treatise. Cromwell and the Duke of Norfolk also, by the royal command, repaired to Lambeth, conveying to the Archbishop assurances that the esteem of the King was unabated.

It was not probable that the Romanists would suffer the Statute to remain unexecuted. Latimer and Shaxton, soon after they had resigned their Bishoprics, were presented for having spoken against the six Articles, and were committed to prison. The Commissioners proceeded with the greatest severity, framing their interrogatories not only on the literal meaning of the Statute, but on collateral and presumptive circumstances. In a short time, not less than five hundred persons were imprisoned, charged with a violation of the Act; their number was their best protection against its penalties; for even the Lord Chancellor united with Cromwell and Cranmer in representing the difficulty, as well as the cruelty, of executing the law upon so large a body of delinquents.

Under this calamitous reverse, there was yet one circumstance which prevented the Reformers from falling into utter despair, and their enemies from improving their success into a complete victory. At the intercession of Cranmer, the perusal of the Scriptures was allowed even to private persons, and letters patent were directed to Cromwell, granting to the people "the free and liberal use of the Bible in our own natural English tongue<sup>t</sup>." The translation, which, by the care of the Primate, had been finished two years before, was now reprinted, with an excellent preface written by himself. It contained an address to two different classes of men: the first, such as would not read the Scriptures themselves, and laboured to

<sup>t</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. iii. no. xv.

prevent others; the second, such as read the Scriptures to no good purpose. To the first class he urged, that even custom might be adduced for reading the Bible in the vulgar tongue, and he proved that the custom had not been discontinued more than a century. The fact was incontrovertible, that the Scriptures had been translated into Saxon, and that various copies of this translation remained in old abbeys. When the Saxon language became obsolete, a translation was made in the newer and more common dialect, and of this last translation many copies were yet in existence. While Cranmer thus refuted by argument the enemies of translations, he addressed the other class, those who read the Scriptures without fruit, in some practical observations of great impressiveness. The whole preface is an attestation of the useful learning and the unfeigned piety of its author, of his ability to convince and to persuade.

In the prosecution of his good work, Cranmer was encountered by Gardiner, who, in a conference held in the presence of the King, maintained, that the Apostolical Canons were of equal authority with the Scriptures. But to the theological opposition of Gardiner Cranmer had long been accustomed, and he now found support in a quarter where he had formerly experienced opposition. Death, which impartially dissolves human friendships and enmities, had deprived him of the valuable aid of Fox, and, within a few months after, had removed his dangerous, because reputable antagonist, Stokesley. The vacant sees of Hereford and London were occupied successively by Boner, who had been distinguished as a diplomatist, but not as a divine. To the patronage of Cromwell, Boner had been indebted for his introduction into public life, and the apparent correspondence of his religious opinions with those of Cromwell and Cranmer led to his subsequent advancement in the Church. From the Bishopric of Hereford he was quickly translated to the influential see

of London, as being likely to promote the cause of the Reformation by his boldness and activity.

During the short interval which elapsed between the promotion of Boner and the fall of Cromwell, these expectations were not disappointed. While Bishop of Hereford, he had been sent on an embassy to Paris, and, during his residence there, had been singularly useful in superintending the English impression of the Bible then printing. After his promotion to the see of London, he promptly obeyed the royal injunction of providing Bibles for general use, and in the cathedral of Saint Paul set up six copies, that all persons capable of reading might have free access to the sacred volume. Upon the pillars to which these Bibles were chained was fixed an admonition, that all who came thither to read should lay aside vain-glory, hypocrisy, and other corrupt affections, and bring with them dispositions suitable to the edification of their souls, as discretion, benevolence, veneration, and quietness. They were enjoined not to draw multitudes around them, not to make expositions of what they read, nor by reading aloud to interrupt the celebration of divine service, nor to enter into disputes concerning the meaning of any text<sup>a</sup>.

While the art of printing was yet in its infancy, that of reading was not a common attainment, and it is only by adverting to this circumstance, that an adequate idea can be formed of the sensation caused by such a publication of the Scriptures, and by the permission that all ranks might read or hear them. Crowds resorted daily to the cathedral, and such as were able to read distinctly were attended by a large train. Many persons in their old age learned to read, that they might themselves study the word of God; others sent their children to school, and afterwards ac-

<sup>a</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 605. and Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. i. c. xxi. p. 120.

companied them to the church, that they might hear the divine oracles from the lips of their offspring.

The publication of the letters patent, authorizing the free use of the Scriptures, was the greatest benefit conferred on religion by the administration of Cromwell, but it was also the last. In the succeeding Session of Parliament, other measures were proposed by this minister, by which the late Statute would have been mitigated in its severity, and by which the Reformation would have been advanced. At the opening of the Session, the Lord Chancellor having briefly stated the motives of the King in calling together his Parliament, Cromwell, in his capacity of Vicegerent, followed with a long address. He assured the two Houses, that the King desired nothing so much as a firm union in religious matters; but the rashness and licentiousness of some, and the inveterate superstition of others, had caused great dissensions, to the sorrow of all good Christians. While some were called papists, others were called heretics; showing a bitterness of spirit the more unaccountable and less to be excused, since the holy Scriptures, by the King's care, were in the hands of all, and in a language universally understood. But notwithstanding this benevolent disposition in the King, the Scriptures were perverted, on all sides, by men who studied to gratify their passions, rather than to govern their wills by the divine law. The King leaned neither to the right hand, nor to the left, neither to the one nor to the other party, but placed the pure and sincere doctrine of the Christian faith before his eyes; and the same faith he now intended to set before his subjects, without any corrupt admixture. It was also his intention to continue such ceremonies as might tend to the reverend worship of God. Being resolved that Christ, the Gospel of Christ, and the truth should have the victory, he had appointed two committees: the one to form a popular exposition of those things which were necessary for the erudition of a

Christian man; the other to examine the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and to determine which were worthy of being retained, and which were of no use. Such were the pious and benevolent intentions of the King, whose commendations were the theme of Cromwell's peroration. "His due praises," the Vicégerent said, "a man of far greater eloquence than myself could not fully set forth <sup>x</sup>."

Speedily the time approached, when the praises of Henry were to be celebrated by some more fortunate and favoured, though not more able, minister. Two days after Cromwell had pronounced this encomium he was created Earl of Essex, the male line of the family of Bourchier, who had enjoyed the title, being extinct. Two months had scarcely elapsed, after he had received this signal mark of confidential favour, before he was arrested on a charge of high treason, and committed a prisoner to the Tower.

To discover the real cause of Cromwell's disgrace and ruin, at this distance of time, would be a fruitless research, for probably there was a combination of causes. That which has been commonly assigned was abundantly sufficient: his proposal of an alliance between his sovereign and Anne of Cleves, and the unconquerable antipathy of Henry to the Queen whom his minister had selected. The motives which prompted Cromwell to recommend such an alliance were doubtless politic, but at no period of his life was Henry induced to sacrifice his inclinations to political convenience.

As none of Henry's ministers had possessed greater power, so none had more enemies. By the ancient nobility he was despised for the meanness of his extraction and the loftiness of his demeanour: by the clergy he was hated for his assumption and exercise of the ecclesiastical functions. The Duke of Norfolk had long

<sup>x</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 550.

harboured against him a rancorous hatred, which, on one occasion, had burst forth in the presence of Cranmer; and the favourable crisis of gratifying his revenge having now arrived, it was not lost: Henry was violently enamoured of Catherine Howard, his niece; and both the Duke of Norfolk and Gardiner encouraged a passion which must wean their sovereign from his confidential minister, and eventually change the system of his religious policy.

The fall of Cromwell in many of its circumstances resembled that of his early patron, Wolsey. He was not only insulted by his enemies, but forsaken by his flatterers and dependants. Cranmer alone, forgetful of personal safety, ventured to plead in his behalf, and to write to the King a letter of remonstrance. He thus reminded their common sovereign of the past services of his unfortunate colleague: “I loved him as a friend, but chiefly for the distinguished regard he always discovered to your Highness; but now, if he is a traitor, I am sorry that I misplaced my affection, and took him into any share of confidence. But I am more concerned on another account, for who can your Highness trust, if he has deceived you? I am perfectly at a loss in whom you may confide; but shall never cease to beg of God Almighty to send a counsellor in his place, so well qualified for your service, both in abilities and inclination, as I ever thought this person to have been.”<sup>y</sup>

An act of friendship so noble on the part of Cranmer was unavailing in averting the fate of Cromwell. The unhappy minister, abandoned to his own reflections, gave himself up to despair, and, like Wolsey, his mind was completely subdued by the frowns of his Prince. After his confinement, he was commanded by the King to write a statement of the part which he had taken in promoting the marriage with Anne of Cleves. This task he executed with his accustomed ability, and exculpated himself from

<sup>y</sup> It was copied by Lord Herbert from the original.

any improper interference in the transaction; but, after offering this justification, he concluded his letter in the following expressions of abject despondence: "The frail flesh inciteth me continually to call to your Grace for mine offences; and thus Christ save, protect, and keep you." And immediately after his signature, he added, "Most gracious Prince, I cry for mercy! mercy! mercy!"

His enemies were convinced, that, if he had a legal trial, there was not sufficient evidence to convict him, and it was therefore resolved to proceed against him by a Bill of attainder. The Bill hastily passed the House of Lords; in the House of Commons some informality retarded its progress; but at length it was finally agreed to by both Houses, and received the royal assent. The crimes alleged against him in the Act of attainder were various, but his encouragement of heretics, and his invasion of the Christian priesthood, occupied a conspicuous place<sup>a</sup>.

The attainder of Cromwell was almost immediately followed by the King's divorce from Anne of Cleves, and both measures received from Parliament the same ready concurrence. A motion was made in the House of Lords, that an address might be presented to the King, praying that he would suffer the validity of his marriage to be tried. The Lords having assented to the motion, and having obtained the concurrence of the Commons, a deputation of both Houses waited on the King with their united petition. The King, when he assented to it, made a solemn protestation, that he would conceal nothing relative to the affair, and that there was nothing dearer to him than the glory of God, the good of the commonwealth, and the declaration of truth.

A commission was accordingly issued to the Convocation, authorizing that body to try the validity of the marriage, and the preponderance of the Romish party

<sup>a</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. iii. no. xvii.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. no. xvi.

there was evident from the activity of Gardiner. The case was opened by him, and he was one of the commissioners for the examination of witnesses. The pretexts for the dissolution of the marriage were, first, an alleged precontract between Anne of Cleves and the Marquis of Lorrain; and, secondly, the King's unconquerable antipathy to her, and his refusal to consummate the marriage. On these allegations, the whole Convocation, without a dissentient voice, pronounced the marriage null and void, and both parties freed from its bond. The sentence was signed by both Houses of Convocation, and the instrument was authenticated by the seals of the two Archbishops<sup>b</sup>.

In this measure Cranmer participated, and he must consequently share in the disgrace, but he can only incur the censure of unwilling acquiescence. The divorce must have been not less abhorrent from his inclinations, than it was repugnant to his principles. As President of the Convocation, it was his duty to report to the House of Lords the judgment of Convocation, but he executed the office without offering any comment. The Bishop of Winchester delivered the sentence in writing, and afterwards enlarged on the reasons by which it was supported. By a conference with Anne of Cleves, it was ascertained that the divorce was a measure not unacceptable, and an Act of Parliament formally dissolved a marriage which the previous sentence of Convocation had determined to be invalid<sup>c</sup>.

After the Parliament had shown this mark of compliance with the King's inclinations, after it had still farther consulted them in altering the existing law on the subject of divorce and precontracts<sup>d</sup>, the King dissolved it. Four days after its dissolution, Cromwell, who had remained in the Tower since his arrest, suffered the penalty of treason.

<sup>b</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. iii. no. xix.

<sup>c</sup> Stat. 32 Hen. VIII. c. 25.

<sup>d</sup> Stat. 32 Hen. VIII. c. 38.

No effort was left untried by him for the preservation of his life: he wrote in such moving terms, that Henry caused his letter to be read thrice, and discovered a faint wish to relent; but the fascinations of Catherine Howard, and the arts of her family, overcame the suggestions of clemency, and Cromwell was executed on Tower-hill. At the place of execution, tenderness for his son prevented him from expatiating on the injustice of his sentence. He contented himself with declaring that he was condemned by the law to die, and with offering thanks to God for having brought him to that death on account of his many offences. He acknowledged his sins against God, and his offences against his Prince, who had raised him to a high station from a low degree. He denied that he had ever favoured heretical doctrines; he confessed, indeed, that he had been seduced, but that he died in the catholic religion, not doubting any article of faith or sacrament of the Church. Having desired the surrounding spectators to pray for the King, for the young Prince, and for himself, he offered a fervent supplication for the forgiveness of his sins, and for his admission to eternal glory, and, having ended his devotions, submitted himself to the executioner\*.

Thus fell Cromwell, Earl of Essex, a man whose great dexterity in business and practical wisdom had raised him to the highest dignities. With him ceased the office of *Ecclesiastical Vicegerent*; an office entirely incompatible with the nature and rights of a Christian priesthood, and entirely distinct from the regal supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs. It was an office now become ungrateful to the King as well as the Clergy, and no one was ambitious of succeeding to a station which had proved so fatal to its first possessor.

The victory of Gardiner and the triumph of doctrinal Romanism were now confirmed, and it was now that Boner, who had hitherto dissembled, assumed his real character.

\* [See Essays, &c. by the Rev. S. R. Maitland, D.D. xi. p. 225 sqq.]

While Cromwell possessed the chief administration of the Church, Boner and Gardiner were apparently at enmity; but when Cromwell was no more, there was no obstacle to their avowed coalition. It was the general expectation that Cranmer would be the next victim. Already he had been denounced, in the House of Commons, as the promoter of all the heresy that was in England; private insinuations, as well as public charges, were preferred; and nothing but the unshaken friendship of Henry could have preserved him during that short period, when Catherine Howard and the Duke of Norfolk had supplanted Cromwell in the royal confidence.

In the last address which Cromwell made to the Parliament as Ecclesiastical Vicegerent, he announced that the King had appointed two committees; the one for the purpose of framing a popular compendium of the Christian doctrines, and the other for reviewing the rites and ceremonies of divine worship. The committee<sup>e</sup> last named was the earliest in the completion of its labours; and their result was a *Rationale*, or a treatise explaining the meaning, and justifying the continuance, of that ceremonial, which it was thought fit to retain<sup>f</sup>. There was a new impression of the Liturgy, according to the use of the Church of Salisbury, an office at this time more generally used than any other. Salisbury was always celebrated for its choral services, and its Bishop, in the episcopal College, occupied the dignity of Precentor of all England.

<sup>e</sup> The committee consisted of the Bishops of Salisbury, Bath and Wells, Ely, Chichester, Worcester, and Llandaff. Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 550.

<sup>f</sup> Collier has corrected the error of Burnet, who asserted that no new books for divine service were printed during the reign of Henry VIII. The title of the *Rationale* is this: "Portiforium secundum usum Sarum, noviter impressum, et à plurimis purgatum mendis. In quo nomen Romano pontifici falsò ascriptum omittitur, una cum aliis, quæ Christianissimo nostri Regis statuto repugnant," 1541. Collier, Eccles. Hist. p. ii. b. iii. p. 103.

Though the ceremonies prescribed by the RATIONALE were multifarious, and exceeding the simplicity of Christian worship, yet their significance is ingeniously explained, and, more than this, the foundation on which they rest is rightly laid. There is acknowledged to be a wide difference between the commandments and works enjoined in Scripture, and ordained by God, and rites and ceremonies ordained by men. The precepts of God are not to be infringed, abolished, or altered; but ceremonies instituted by men may, on reasonable causes, be done away or changed by human authority. Yet when such ceremonies are prescribed for the sake of order and decency, if they be not superstitious, they ought to be reverently observed by the people, not as works necessary for salvation, but as useful means to promote piety. They should be practised in conformity with the admonition of the Apostle: “Let all things be done decently, and in order.”

As the members of this committee were warmly attached to the splendour of the Romish ritual, the alterations were inconsiderable. The collects in which prayers were offered for the Pope, the offices for Thomas à Becket and some other saints, were omitted; but so slight was the change which the committee introduced, that in many churches the missals and breviaries already in use were retained.

The work which the other and larger committee had undertaken, as it required a longer time for its performance from the necessity of the case, was farther delayed by a want of unanimity in its members<sup>s</sup>. When there was a prospect of a war between England and France, Cranmer thought it a favourable crisis of proposing a qualification of the six Articles, and of mitigating the rigour of that Statute.

<sup>s</sup> This committee consisted of the two Archbishops, the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, Rochester, Hereford, and Saint David's; with Drs. Thisleby, Robertson, Cox, Day, Oglethorp, Redmayne, Edge-worth, Crayford, Symonds, Robins, and Tresham. *Ibid.*

But as a war between England and France occasioned an alliance with the Emperor, Gardiner seized the opportunity of impeding the Reformation, and of urging a religious as well as a political union.

In the Convocation, the translation of the Bible then in use was censured by Gardiner for its barbarisms. He asserted that there were many words in the New Testament almost consecrated by their appropriation, and therefore incapable of being translated. Cranmer, foreseeing that a condemnation of the present translation would again render the Bible a sealed book, moved the King that the revisal of the present version should be submitted to the Universities. The Bishops, not without some indignation, objected that the learning of the Universities was of late greatly decayed, and that the two Houses of Convocation concentrated the theological erudition of the land, and concluded by entering a protestation against the conduct of their metropolitan<sup>h</sup>.

Gardiner had more success in the next Session of Parliament. By his instigation, a Statute was enacted, grossly misnamed "An Act for the advancement of true religion, and abolishment of the contrary<sup>i</sup>." Its object was stated to be the prevention of dissensions, by establishing a form of sincere doctrine as taught by the Apostles. All the books of the Old and New Testaments in the translation of Tindal were prohibited, and the prefaces and notes of all other translations. No one was permitted to read or expound the Scriptures in any open assembly without a licence from the King or the Ordinary. Any nobleman or gentleman might cause the Bible to be read to him in or about his house quietly and without disturbance. Every merchant who was a householder might also read it; but

<sup>h</sup> The Bishops of Ely and Saint David's excepted. Burnet has shown that Fuller has misplaced the date of this transaction.

<sup>i</sup> Stat. 34 Hen. VIII. c. 1. Lord Herb. Life of Hen. VIII. p. 559.

no woman, unless of the higher ranks, no artificers, apprentices, journeymen, servants, or husbandmen, were allowed the privilege<sup>k</sup>.

Preceded by this legal prohibition of reading the Scriptures, the people received from their Sovereign the NECESSARY DOCTRINE AND ERUDITION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN; a work whose materials are as heterogeneous as the opinions of those who composed it were discordant; a work which in the present day has occasioned much discussion and dispute, arising from the prejudices of its readers. One party has confidently appealed to it as a criterion of the opinions of the Reformers on many important doctrinal points, in opposition to the Church from which they had separated; another party has condemned it, in the most unqualified terms, as leaning even in doctrine towards Popery rather than Protestantism.

In contradistinction to the previous work of the Institution of a Christian Man, which was called the Bishop's book, the present formulary was called the King's book. It was not, like the former, sanctioned by the authority of Convocation, but was composed by a committee originally nominated by the King, and their compositions received the stamp of his personal approbation.

Henry himself had a considerable share in the execution of the work; the chief part was corrected by his own hand; and evidence still remains of the diligence with which he had collected and compared the opinions of his Bishops and Divines on the different points of discussion. The preface was probably written by himself, and, among other matter, contains a vindication of the late prohibition of the Bible. The Christian Church is divided into those who are to teach, and those who are to be taught. The

\* There was a curious proviso, that the Lord Chancellor in Parliament, Generals and Officers in the field, the Judges and Recorders, and the Speaker of the House of Commons, might use the Scriptures as a text, and as they were accustomed.

one part, whose office is to instruct others, may and ought to study both the Old and New Testaments; but for the other part, whose duty it is to be taught, the reading of the Scriptures is not absolutely necessary, but may be “tolerated or taken away,” as “the Prince and policy of the realm shall think convenient<sup>1</sup>. ” This liberty the law had lately abridged, esteeming it sufficient for those who are so restrained, to hear and bear away the doctrine of the Scriptures taught by their preachers.

In the plan of the work, it was thought fit that faith should be defined before any exposition was given of the Articles of faith. The Church of Rome had taught that faith consisted in an implicit belief in her own dogmata, or that true Christian faith implied nothing more than submission to the authority of the Church. The Reformers, on the contrary, maintained, that the object of faith is the Holy Scriptures, because they had been revealed by God. But hence a question naturally arose,—what was that saving faith by which man is justified? This could not be a bare assent to the truth of divine revelation, for in that sense the devils believed; therefore the Reformers placed it in an assurance of salvation by the death of Christ. They made holiness and all other graces requisites in the composition of faith, though they would not formally make them parts of it. The Church of Rome, taking advantage of the incautious language of some Reformers, stigmatized them all as Solifidians; the Reformers denied the charge. They declared that good works were indispensably necessary to salvation; but here a second question occurred,—what were good works? The Church of Rome had maintained, that works which had an immediate honour to God or His saints were more valuable than works done to other men. On the other hand, the Reformers taught that justice and mercy, done in obedience to the precepts of God, were the only good works necessary to salvation. The Church of

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Lloyd's *Formularies* of Hen. VIII. p. 218.

Rome held that good works were in themselves meritorious, and that they could purchase the blessings of the kingdom of heaven; the Reformers asserted, that although good works were necessary, yet the purchase of heaven was only by the death and intercession of Christ. A question was also raised—whether obedience was an essential part of faith? The Reformers taught that obedience necessarily followed from faith, or was its necessary fruit, but that it was not an essential ingredient<sup>m</sup>.

That these disputes might be satisfactorily adjusted, it was deemed necessary, at the beginning of the Erudition, to give an accurate definition of faith. The difficult and delicate task was assigned by Cranmer to Redmayn, the Master of Trinity College in Cambridge. Redmayn was a man whom many Protestants were afraid to praise, because he pursued a middle course between them and the Romanists; but he was the most learned and judicious divine of his age, and his Christian virtues commanded the reluctant commendation of his opponents<sup>n</sup>. He executed the task assigned to him with that solidity and clearness which abundantly justifies his high reputation and the wisdom of Cranmer's choice<sup>o</sup>. Faith in the Holy Scriptures has two principal significations; the one, as it is a divine gift, separate from hope and charity, and as such begets a persuasion and belief of the truths both of natural and revealed religion: this faith is but an introduction into the Christian religion, and if it proceed no further is called a dead faith, because it is destitute of the life and efficacy of charity. The other faith is that which begets submission to the will of God, and has hope, love,

<sup>m</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 573—587.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. vol. i. b. iii. p. 575.

<sup>o</sup> "A man savouring at that time somewhat more of superstition than of true religion, after the zeal of the Pharisees, yet not so malignant or harmful, but of a civil and quiet disposition, and also so liberal in well doing, that few poor scholars were in that University which fared not better by his purse." Fox's Acts and Mon. Life of Latimer.

and obedience to the divine precepts joined with it: this is the effectual faith that worketh by charity, and which Saint Paul affirms to be of value and strength in Christ Jesus; this is the faith which every Christian professes and covenants to keep by the Sacrament of Baptism.

In those parts of the Scripture where it is said that we are justified by faith, it must not be understood as a separate virtue from hope, charity, the fear of God, and repentance, but as united with these qualities, and comprehending obedience to the whole doctrine and religion of Christ. As for the definition of faith proposed by some, as including predestination and perseverance, it is not warranted by Scripture. Such a faith could not be known; for although God's promises made in Christ are immutable, yet they are not made to man, but on conditions. Though God never fails in His promises to man, yet such was the frailty of man, that he often failed in his performances to God, and thus forfeited all right to the Divine promises, which are not made but upon conditions.

After this exposition of faith, the Erudition contains a short explanation of the Creed, having a paraphrase on each Article, with practical inferences. A writer, who was never suspected of an inclination to Popery, has candidly acknowledged, that it is one of the best practical books extant, and that he never rose from its often repeated perusal without edification<sup>p</sup>. The style is strong, nervous, but yet fitted for the meanest capacities. There is nothing in it that is controverted between the Papists and the Reformers, unless it be that Article which relates to the holy Catholic Church, an article which was probably written by the King himself. The Catholic Church is defined as comprehending all assemblies of men over the whole world that receive the faith of Christ, who ought to hold an unity of love and brotherly concord. This Church is not limited to any one place or region, but is universal

<sup>p</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 577.

wherever it pleaseth God to call people to Him in the profession of Christ's name and faith. There is a long digression on the unreasonable pretensions of the Romish Church, which resolves catholic unity into a submission to the Pope. Neither the whole catholic Church, nor a separate catholic Church, is bound to acknowledge any other universal governor than Christ. Catholic unity is preserved by the aid of the Holy Spirit, not by the authority of the Bishop of Rome.

From the Creed, the Erudition proceeds to an examination of the nature and number of the Sacraments. Particular care was observed in collecting the opinions of the committee on this point; and, whatever may be thought of the result, there can be but one sentiment on the fairness with which their conflicting determinations were collected and compared. The whole subject was broken into distinct questions, and they were given to each member of the committee, who was required to return an unbiassed answer. When these answers were returned, two of the body were appointed to compare them, and form an extract of the particulars on which they agreed or differed. Cranmer and some other divines proposed that the number of the Sacraments should be reduced to two, but the majority of the committee decided that the whole number acknowledged by the Church of Rome should be retained.

Baptism was explained as in the Articles agreed on by the Convocation, but the doctrine of original sin was more strongly asserted. This Sacrament ought to be administered to infants, because they are born in original sin, and because original sin is remitted and taken away by Baptism.

The Sacrament of Penance is properly the absolution of the priest on such as were truly penitent for their sins; but a caution was added, that penitence alone could not merit or obtain this remission. Man can offer no satis-

faction to God for sin, the only satisfaction allowed and accepted by God being the death and sufferings of Jesus Christ.

The Sacrament of the Altar was described in the Erudition as the “most high and principal Sacrament of the New Testament.” Transubstantiation was strongly and unequivocally asserted, as also the concomitancy of the blood with the flesh, so that communion in both kinds was not necessary; and, lastly, the utility of hearing the service of the mass without partaking of the communion.

Matrimony was stated to be a Sacrament first instituted by God, and then sanctified by Christ. The degrees prohibited by the Levitical law were declared to be of perpetual obligation, and the bond of marriage to be indissoluble.

The Sacrament of Orders implied a gift or grace of ministration in Christ’s Church, given of God to Christian men by the imposition of a Bishop’s hands. Though the form of laying on of hands ought to be retained, yet there is no certain rule prescribed or limited by the Word of God for the nomination, election, presentation, or appointment of ecclesiastical ministers: these things were left to the laws of every community, with the assent of the supreme magistrate. The office of ecclesiastical ministers was to preach, administer the Sacraments, to bind and loose, and to pray for the whole flock, yet these duties must be executed under such limitations as were prescribed by the laws. The Scripture made express mention of two orders only, Priests and Deacons, and these were conferred by imposition of the hands of the Apostles<sup>1</sup>. To these orders the primitive Church had added some inferior degrees, which were useful in the preservation of discipline, though not of divine institution. By the law

<sup>1</sup> Burnet has not stated the sense of the Erudition fairly. Two orders, those of Priests and Deacons, are conferred by a third, namely, Apostles. See Collier’s Eccl. Hist. b. iii. p. 104.

of God no Bishop was superior to another Bishop; any authority of this kind was derived from the consent and ordinance of men; therefore the Bishop of Rome could have no authority in England.

Confirmation was a Sacrament used in the primitive Church in imitation of the Apostles, for they conferred the gifts of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands: such were not the effects of Confirmation of modern times, yet still it was a rite not to be contemned or neglected.

Extreme Unction was the seventh Sacrament, and it was practised and recommended by the Apostles themselves. It was originally instituted for the health both of the body and soul. Though the sick person did not always recover, yet remission of sins was its effect. But this Sacrament was efficacious only to those who by penance were restored to a state of grace.

In the conclusion of this part of the Erudition, the connexion between the seven Sacraments was ingeniously pointed out, and their effects on the true Christian believer were recapitulated.

To the seven Sacraments succeeded an explanation of the Decalogue, not essentially different from that contained in the Institution of a Christian Man. It has been said, that Gardiner wished to blend the second Commandment with the first, but that Cranmer contended for its insertion at full length: a middle way was therefore adopted; it was placed as a distinct command, but it was abridged. The exposition of the Commandments is for the most part unexceptionable.

After the Decalogue followed a paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer, in the preface of which it is said, that the unlearned should be accustomed to say their prayers in their mother tongue, that they may be excited to greater devotion. To this paraphrase was subjoined the Angel's salutation to the blessed Virgin, and the caution given in

the former treatise of the Institution is repeated, that the blessed Virgin is not an object of worship.

In the sequel of the Erudition is an article on each of these three doctrinal points,—free-will, justification, and good works. The article of free-will corresponds with the Augsburger Confession<sup>r</sup>, and teaches, that if the will of man were not free, all commandments and threatenings would be vain; yet this will, without the help of the Holy Spirit, is incapable of performing any work of righteousness acceptable to God. The Erudition, as well as the Augsburger Confession, appeals to Saint Augustin<sup>s</sup>, who has declared, “that free-will is in man after his fall, which thing whosoever denieth is not a catholic man.” As Scripture shows, on the one hand, that free-will is still in man, so, on the other hand, it shows that the grace of God is necessary to assist him in the design and the performance of any good action. All men, and chiefly preachers, are therefore to be admonished, that, “in this high matter,” they so “attemper and moderate themselves, that neither they so preach the grace of God, that they take away thereby free-will, nor on the other side so extol free-will, that injury be done to the grace of God.”

Justification is defined to be the making us righteous before God, whereby we are reconciled to Him, and made heirs of eternal life. God is the chief cause of our justification, yet man, prevented by Divine grace, by his free consent and obedience cooperates in the attainment of his own justification. For though it is procured only by the merits of the death of Christ, yet every man must use his endeavours to obtain a personal share in it. A distinction is made between a first and a final justification. All curious reasonings concerning predestination are to be laid aside; and, according to the plain manner of

<sup>r</sup> Art. 18. Sylloge Confessionum, 2d ed. p. 129. Oxon. 1827.

<sup>s</sup> Hypognosticon, lib. iii.

speaking and teaching in Scripture, we ought always to be in dread of our natural frailty, and not assure ourselves of our election in any other way than by feeling spiritual motions in our hearts, and by the tokens of good and virtuous living, and perseverance unto the end. Therefore, as, on the one hand, we are justified freely by the grace of God, so, on the other hand, when it is said that we are justified by faith, it must be such a faith as includes faith, hope, repentance, charity, and a desire to bring forth good works; yet all these gifts come of the free mercy and grace of God, therefore we are properly said to be justified freely.

Good works are declared absolutely necessary to salvation, but by these are meant not merely outward corporal works, but inward spiritual works; nor were they superstitious inventions, nor moral works done by the power of natural reason, but the works of charity, flowing from a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, and such works are meritorious towards attaining eternal life. The merit of good works may be reconciled with the freedom of God's mercies, since all our works are done by His grace; so that we have no cause of boasting, but must ascribe all to the grace and goodness of God.

The last chapter of the Erudition relates to prayers for departed souls, and contains the same doctrine with that set forth in the book of Articles.

Such was the Erudition, the last formulary set forth in the reign of Henry. From the abstract given of the doctrinal Articles, the reader may determine whether they incline to Romanism; for to say, as some have said, that they incline to Popery, is an absurdity. If there be any difference in the doctrines of the *Erudition*, from those asserted in the later and authorized formularies of the English Church, the difference, as will be hereafter seen, is (with some exceptions) merely a difference of terms<sup>t</sup>.

<sup>t</sup> A curious argument has been adduced to show, what is called the  
VOL. I. P

From the elevation of Catherine Parr to the dignity of Queen Consort may be dated the last years of Henry the Eighth. His character was not essentially changed, but he was more susceptible of the blandishments of flattery. His last Queen not only prevented the severity of the law from being exercised against the Reformers, but prevailed on him to consent to many acts for the encouragement of religion. Yet if he were more accessible to flattery, he was also more open to suspicion, arising from the timidity of impaired health and declining years.

Since the enactment of the Statute of the six Articles, 1544 those who denied the regal supremacy, and those who denied the corporal presence, were indiscriminately executed; but with respect to the vigilance with which the two kinds of offenders were detected, the balance was decidedly against the Reformers. Cranmer, however, at length recovered something of his former influence with his Sovereign, and Gardiner proportionably declined in favour. It was then that this sanguinary Statute was mitigated, and with the exception of Anne Askew, the condition of the Sacramentarians was not that of rigorous persecution.

More than an exemption from legal penalties was obtained by Cranmer. When Henry undertook in person his last war against France, before his departure he sanctioned a translation of some Prayers and a Litany in the English tongue. The Preface contained the following advice: "It is very convenient and acceptable to God that

popish tendency of the Erudition, viz. that Boner, in Queen Mary's reign, incorporated a considerable part of it into a work published by his authority, in order to promote the reestablishment of popery in his diocese. By parity of reasoning, the Homilies of Edward the Sixth are of a popish tendency, for in that very work, Boner also incorporated the Homily entitled, "The Misery of all Mankind." The work alluded to is a collection of tracts published by Harpsfield, Boner's chaplain. It is in the Bodleian library.

you should use private prayer in your mother tongue, that, understanding what you ask of God, you may more earnestly and fervently desire the same, your hearts and minds agreeing with your mouth and words."

In the beginning of the following year, by the suggestion, as it is presumed, of Cranmer, the King commanded that several superstitious and unwarrantable customs should be abolished.<sup>1545</sup> To make this order acceptable, the Archbishop suggested that the reason of abolishing such ceremonies should be fully explained to the people, lest tender consciences should be offended. Their obedience would then be given with readiness, whereas otherwise it would be yielded with discontent and murmurs.

The last intended step towards reformation was a revisal of the Service of the Mass; and the King commanded Cranmer to form a Communion Service, instead of the old Service in the Missal<sup>u</sup>. A peace having been concluded between Henry and Francis, while the French ambassador, Annebault, was in London, it has been said that the two Monarchs not only themselves agreed to abolish the Mass, but to persuade the Emperor to do the same. Cranmer began the revisal, but the death of the King prevented its completion<sup>x</sup>.

The concluding year of Henry's life was distinguished by the disgrace of his old counsellor, the Duke of Norfolk; a nobleman who had preserved the second place in the favour of his Sovereign by not aspiring to the first. Throughout a long career he had been successful, and few subjects could plead more essential benefits to the State, as a title to the confidence of its Supreme Head; and in religious opinions he had coincided with Henry. A principled opponent of papal usurpation, he had resisted the legatine authority of Wolsey; an inveterate enemy to

<sup>u</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. i. c. 30. p. 193.

<sup>x</sup> Fox's Acts and Mon. vol. ii. p. 495.

the reformed doctrines, he had joined with Gardiner in reducing the influence of Cranmer.

The King, “ who never hated nor ruined any one by halves,” had cut off the rising hope of the Norfolk family, and the accomplished Surrey had paid the forfeit of his life. This was not sufficient: the ruin of that family was to be completed by the attaignment of the father. As his eminent services were forgotten, so his submissions could not avert his doom. A Parliament was called, ostensibly for the coronation of the Prince of Wales, but really for the attaignment of the Duke of Norfolk<sup>z</sup>.

That nobleman was indebted for the preservation of his life, not to the clemency of his Prince, nor to the justice of Parliament, but to an act of Providence. Henry

died in the night previous to the morning ap-

Jan. 28. pointed for his execution, and the royal warrant being of no force, it was not thought advisable to sully the new reign of an infant Prince with blood,

Of the circumstances which characterized the dying moments of Henry, opposite accounts have been transmitted. The Papists have insinuated<sup>a</sup> that he was inclined to a reconciliation with the See of Rome; but the insinuation rests on no foundation, and it is contradicted by the whole of his public conduct. In the last of his Parliaments, the King’s ecclesiastical authority was asserted in the most comprehensive terms. By a Statute then passed<sup>b</sup> it was declared, that Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction but by, under, and from the King; and that the King is the only undoubted Supreme Head of the Church of England and of Ireland.

<sup>y</sup> Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 693.

<sup>z</sup> A passage has been omitted here, taken originally from Foxe, which misled Burnet. Ed.

<sup>a</sup> Sanderi Schism. Anglic. p. 170.

<sup>b</sup> Stat. 37 Hen. VIII. c. 17.

Different is the most authentic relation of Henry's last hours<sup>c</sup>. When the signs of death appeared, Sir Anthony Denny alone, of all his attendants, had the courage and honesty to remind him of his end, and the communication was accompanied with an exhortation to prepare for futurity, to remember his former life, and to call upon God for mercy through Jesus Christ. Contrary to expectation, Henry received the intimation with gratitude; and, with expressions of deep contrition for his many sins, placed his hope and confidence in the mercies of Jesus Christ, by which even his sins were exceeded. Having been asked whether any churchman should be summoned, he named Cranmer. The Archbishop was then at Croydon, and before he reached the palace the King was speechless. On being requested to give some sign of his dying in the faith in Christ, he answered the appeal by a pressure of Cranmer's hand, and expired.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Character of Edward VI.—Earl of Hertford created Duke of Somerset and Protector.—Coronation of Edward, and Address by Cranmer.—The Lord Chancellor removed.—Somerset holds the Protectorate by Letters-Patent.—Prelates favourable to the Reformation.—Character of Ridley.—Royal Visitation.—First Book of Homilies.—Erasmus's Paraphrase.—Gardiner's opposition.—Proceedings in Parliament and in Convocation.—Proclamation.—New Communion Office.—Gardiner sent to the Tower.—First Catechism of Edward VI.—First Service Book.

By an Act of Parliament passed in the latter part of his reign<sup>d</sup>, Henry was empowered to bequeath the Crown to his children by either of his different Queens, with such

<sup>c</sup> Lord Herbert's Life of Henry VIII. p. 634.

<sup>d</sup> Stat. 35 Hen. VIII. c. 1.

limitations as he should think fit; and the first whom he named in the succession was the rightful heir, Edward, his only son, by Jane Seymour. The young Prince 1537, had lost his mother on the day after he was born, Oct. 12. and within a year after her own marriage. Her death could not be called untimely, for she lived not long enough to experience the inconstancy of Henry's affection, and as she left a male heir to the Crown, her memory was endeared, both to the King and the English people.

At the age of six years Edward had been committed to the care of two men, the propriety of whose selection is fully vindicated by their claims on the respect of posterity. Cheke is a name at this day familiar to the lovers of the Greek language; and Cox, though less generally known, will be gratefully remembered for his important services to the exiled Church of England during the Marian persecution.

By those who are fond of collecting examples of short-lived precocity, the native graces and the surprising acquisitions of Prince Edward have been celebrated with warmth, but not with exaggeration. If his attainments were not so vast or so varied as those of the admirable Crichton, it should be remembered that Edward completed only half the scanty measure even of Crichton's days, and that the exploits of Edward have no affinity, like those of Crichton, to the prodigies of poetry and romance. They rest too on unsuspicious testimony, not on the partial and fulsome praise of Hooper, but on the disinterested relation of Cardan<sup>e</sup>, which is declared by himself to be not beyond but below the truth.

While his father lived, Edward, though enjoying the title of Prince of Wales, was not legally possessed of that dignity; and one of the last acts which Henry meditated, but never fulfilled, was to confer on the heir apparent the

<sup>e</sup> ‘Non hæc rhetorice exornata veritatem excedunt, sed sunt minora.’ Cardan. l. xii. de Genituris.

due and accustomed honours. But so indisputable were the claims of Edward to the vacant throne, that he was proclaimed even before the Will of his father was opened. It was then found, that sixteen persons had been nominated as executors of the Will, and as governors of the Prince until he attained the age of eighteen; and besides the executors, the late King had nominated a privy council to assist in the management of public affairs.

When the executors first met, it naturally occurred, that, to facilitate business, one of their number should be called on to preside, but that such a priority in rank should be unaccompanied with any superiority in power. The proposition, after having been ineffectually opposed by the Lord Chancellor Wriothesley, received the assent of the other executors; and the Earl of Hertford, uncle of the King, was declared Protector of the realm, and governor of the royal person. His elevation was conferred under a stipulation, that he should not perform any act without the advice and consent of the other executors.

Such was the result of the first meeting, and at the second, the executors took an oath for the faithful observance of the Will. The privy counsellors were then required to notify the choice of the Protector to the young King, and despatches were sent to the foreign powers; the temporal Peers and the Bishops near the Court were commanded to swear allegiance, and the Bishops, in addition to their oath, were required to take out a new commission for the exercise of their ecclesiastical authority. By this Act, the Bishops acknowledged that they held their sees at the King's pleasure, and were delegated in his name.

Before the Coronation took place, the Earl of Hertford had been elevated in the Peerage to the Dukedom of Somerset. He obtained this title in consequence of a clause in the Will of the late King, requiring the executors to fulfil all his promises of whatever kind, and of evidence being adduced to shew that he intended to bestow a

Dukedom on the Earl of Hertford. The Duke was also appointed Lord Treasurer and Earl Marshal, these places having been designed for him by the late King on the attainder of the Duke of Norfolk.

After the settlement of some preliminary forms, and the funeral of the deceased King, the Coronation was performed with solemnity, though not with splendour. Edward was the first Protestant King, and it was thought right that many ancient forms, prescribed by the popish ritual, should be changed or abolished. To the Archbishop of Canterbury it belonged, by virtue of his office, to direct the ceremonial, and to officiate at the Coronation. On account of the tender age of the King, as well as of the alteration in the religious polity of the kingdom, the ceremonies were few, but they were highly impressive. The customary sermon was omitted, but the deficiency was abundantly supplied by an excellent address from the Archbishop himself<sup>f</sup>. In this address the Primate showed, that, while he forgot not the high estate of the Sovereign, he remembered the tender age of the child; that he remembered also his own sacred station, and the solemn pledge which he had given at the baptism of the young Prince. Having reminded the assembly of the solemn rites of consecration, that they were useful admonitions to remind Kings of their duty to God and to their people, he thus emphatically described to the Prince the ends of the kingly office: "You are to reward virtue, to revenge sin, to justify the innocent, to relieve the poor, to procure peace, to repress violence, and to execute justice throughout your realms." While he thus pointed out the duties of a chief magistrate, he was anxious to disclaim the power usurped by the Popes of deposing Kings for misgovernment. "Being bound by my function to lay these things before your Royal Highness, the one as a reward if you fulfil, the other as a judgment

<sup>f</sup> Strype's Life of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 5. The speech was preserved among the inestimable collections of Archbishop Ussher.

of God if you neglect, them ; yet I openly declare, before the living God, and before the nobles of the land, that I have no commission to denounce your Royal Highness deprived, if you miss in part or in the whole of these performances, much less to draw up indentures between God and your Majesty, or to say that you forfeit your Crown, with a clause for the Bishop of Rome, as had been done by your Majesty's predecessors, King John and his son Henry, of this land." The Archbishop concluded his address with this pious benediction : " The Almighty God of His mercy let the light of His countenance shine upon your Majesty, grant you a prosperous, happy reign, defend you and save you, and let your subjects say, Amen."

The first measure of importance after the Coronation was the removal of the Lord Chancellor from his office. He had affixed the Great Seal to a commission, authorizing the Master of the Rolls and three Masters in Chancery to hear and decide causes in his absence, since he intended to withdraw himself from his court, and to apply himself entirely to affairs of state. Not only the commission itself, but the persons nominated as commissioners were highly offensive to the common lawyers ; the Judges themselves determined that the commission was illegal, and that, by affixing the Great Seal without any warrant from the Privy Council, the Lord Chancellor had forfeited his place, and was liable to fine and imprisonment, at the King's pleasure. The Privy Council assumed the right of dismissing him from his office, but they ventured not to erase his name from the list of executors. His colleagues secured his absence by the fear of legal penalties, but they did not formally exclude him from the trust.

No sooner was his rival, the Lord Chancellor, dismissed, than Somerset perceived that every obstacle was removed from the attainment of his ambitious views. He boldly resolved to hold his office of Protector by a tenure more secure than the revocable consent of the other executors,

and prevailed on his colleagues, too easily for their reputation, to petition the King, that, by letters patent, he might be constituted Governor of the royal person, and Protector of the kingdom. As he now held his office by a different tenure, its powers were enlarged. The other executors were mingled with the rest of the Privy Council; the Protector was authorized to add to their number as many as he thought fit; and the whole body was restrained from acting without his advice and concurrence. Such a change in the administration of the government was no doubt an infringement of the Will of King Henry, and, as that Will was made under the authority of an Act of Parliament, it was a violation of the law. The only, but unsatisfactory, justification of the measure was, that it was adopted by the consent of the majority of executors, and that the powers vested in them they were competent to transfer as well as to resign.

The elevation of Somerset was at first highly gratifying to the Reformers, in whose favour he had openly declared, and his advancement to the Protectorate was on that account promoted by Cranmer. The Archbishop, unfit for political affairs, directed his attention solely to the duties of his function; his aim was reformation, and he thought that he had the supreme authority to animate, approve, and aid his labours. The King, he was convinced, would receive a Protestant education; for not only Somerset, the King's governor, but Cheke and Cox also, the royal preceptors, were careful to impress on their distinguished pupil sound principles of religion, and to turn away his mind from the superstitions of the Romish Church.

In the conclusion of the preceding reign, several Prelates had been promoted who were favourable to the Reformation; Holgate occupied the second station in the Church, in the room of Lee, a bigoted Papist; Heath, a man of moderation, had succeeded Latimer in the see of Worcester; and, above all, Ridley was advanced, in the beginning of

this reign, to the Bishopric of Rochester. Among those who are styled the fathers of the English Reformation, Ridley held the first place in the estimation of its adversaries, and in forming this judgment they displayed a candour and a discrimination not always found among its friends. His conversion from the errors of the Church of Rome had been the result of laborious inquiry and honest conviction, and it was not debased by any rancour towards those opinions which he had conscientiously renounced. But great must be the presumption of the historian who would represent the sentiments of Ridley in any other than his own language: “The cause why I do dissent from the Romish religion is not any study of vain glory or singularity, but of conscience, of my bounden duty towards God, and Christ’s Church, and the salvation of mine own soul; for the which, by God’s grace, I will willingly jeopard here to lose life, lands, and goods, name and fame, and what else is, or can be, unto me pleasant in this world.”

Educated in Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, of which he was afterwards promoted to the government, Ridley was by habit a disciplinarian. Inured by education to scholastic disputation, he knew the strong and weak points in the controversy between the Romish and Reformed Churches. Far from wishing to multiply the causes of division, he traced all minor differences to their right source, or passed them over as questions on which men might differ, and agree to differ. In his estimation, the two great errors of the Church of Rome were, the idolatrous use of the Lord’s Supper, and the usurped authority of the Pope. To him the Church of England is indebted for a reformation in that most important doctrinal point, Transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass; to him she is principally indebted for her apostolical form of Church government; and he must ever be regarded as the pillar of Protestant Episcopacy.

Ridley must now be considered as the chief adviser of Cranmer, though not responsible for Cranmer's personal timidity and irresolution. Like Cranmer, he was resolved to carry on the Reformation by gradual and cautious advances; for both were convinced, by the conduct of foreign reformers, of the necessity of moderation.

It was their first care to institute a Royal Visitation after the method proposed in the last reign, and to supply the visitors with proper Rules and Injunctions. The dioceses of England were divided into six circuits or precincts, and, with a slight variation, two gentlemen, a civilian and a divine, assisted by a registrar, were assigned to every circuit. A proclamation was issued, inhibiting the Archbishops and Bishops from exercising any jurisdiction while the visitation continued.

As the minds of the people had been disturbed by controversies in the pulpit, it was thought necessary to fix some restrictions on preaching. Even the Bishops were not allowed to preach, except in their own cathedrals, and the inferior Clergy were confined to their churches, unless they had a special licence from the King.

Two preliminary measures were requisite, in order to render the visitation useful or effective. One was to compose Homilies for the instruction of the people, now left to ignorance, or led into error; the other was to select some eminent preachers, who might accompany the visitors in their progress. A committee of divines was appointed for the composition of the Homilies, and twelve, on some of the most important points of Christian faith and duty, were completed. Their object was to state, in a plain and practical manner, the terms of salvation, according to the Gospel, because its professors were divided into two dangerous extremes; the one rested entirely on the merit of good works, undervaluing the merits and the sacrifice of Christ; the other relied exclusively on the merits of Christ,

so as to deny the necessity of good works. In the Homilies both these extremes were avoided: on the one hand, the salvation of mankind was ascribed wholly to the death and sufferings of Christ, which alone were efficacious in obtaining the pardon of sin; on the other hand, it was inculcated that there was no salvation through Christ, but to such as repented, and sincerely endeavoured to frame their lives according to the laws of his Gospel<sup>g</sup>.

In order that the New Testament might be better understood, the paraphrase of Erasmus was translated into English, and a copy was enjoined to be deposited in every parish church. The Articles and Injunctions, by which the visitors regulated their inquiries, were the same with those of the last reign during the vicegerency of Cromwell. To these some others, suitable to the advanced state of the Reformation, were added: that all images and monuments of idolatry should be removed; that processions should be discontinued; that the Litany formerly used in these processions should be recited in the choir; that the Epistle and Gospel should be read in English at high mass, and that the Homilies lately set forth by authority should be publicly read. These, and some other Injunctions, were to be observed by the Clergy under the penalties of excommunication, sequestration, or deprivation, according to the enormity of the case<sup>h</sup>.

Furnished with these Injunctions, the visitors began their respective circuits about the same time that the

<sup>g</sup> These Homilies were the work of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hopkins, and Becon, one of Cranmer's chaplains. There is little but internal evidence by which the author of any particular Homily can be ascertained. The Homily "Of the Salvation of Mankind," being the third, as they are now placed, was ascribed by Gardiner to Cranmer; and Cranmer never denied that it was his. The eleventh, in three parts, is by Becon; and it is printed among his works, published by himself, in three volumes folio. It is in the second volume.

<sup>h</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. b. 4. p. 192.

Protector went into Scotland to carry on the war there in person. He returned crowned with success, and prepared to meet the Parliament, for which writs had been issued before his departure. During his absence the visitors had punctually fulfilled their duty, and their Injunctions had generally received due obedience. Boner and Gardiner were the only Prelates who ventured to resist. Although Boner was soon brought to submission, yet as the retraction of his protest, though complete, was ungracious, he was sent to the Fleet prison, and remained in confinement more than two months. When the Homilies were shown to Gardiner, he expressed his disapprobation in no measured terms, and inveighed against the Injunctions as being contrary to the law of God. His objections were accompanied with a solemn protestation against the authority of the visitors, which he boldly delivered before the Privy Council, and having peremptorily refused to obey the Injunctions, or to set forth the Homilies, he was committed to the same prison with Boner.

In several letters to the Protector, as well as in a conference with Cranmer, Gardiner justified his opposition. The Homily "On the Salvation of Mankind" appears to have been the composition of Cranmer; and this Homily was the object of Gardiner's particular reprehension. He complained that it excluded charity from the office of justification; a doctrine as well repugnant to Scripture, [Galat. v. 6. St. James ii. 17.] as contrary to a book published in the last reign by authority, "The Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man;" whereas, in truth, the discordance between the Homilies and the Erudition is apparent rather than essential. The Homily on Salvation asserts, that faith alone is necessary to justification, yet that faith does "not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God," since these qualities are to be "joined with faith in every man that is justified." Though they are excluded from the office of justification,

yet they are component parts of justifying faith. The Erudition says the same thing; and Cranmer might have found a better answer<sup>i</sup> than a concession that a book set forth by royal authority, and with his own concurrence, was heterodox, and that King Henry "was seduced."

If Gardiner failed to show any material difference between the Homilies and the Erudition, he pursued his argument with triumphant success on the opposition between the book of Homilies, and its unsuitable associate, the paraphrase of Erasmus. He contended, that there were many serious errors in the original, for which Erasmus alone must answer; but that the work was rendered still more pernicious by a faulty and garbled translation. The translator had erred, partly from ignorance, and partly from design, and was alike ignorant of the Latin and English languages. Gardiner reminded the Protector, that, when summoned before the Privy Council, he had offered to dispute on the question of justification at Oxford, or to enter into a conference at London. He also urged, that, if the Privy Council assumed an authority above that of Parliament, the Constitution was subverted, and the Act which discharges the subject from obedience to the See of Rome might be overruled by the Board. The King, when of age, would expect the same extent of prerogative as was exercised by the Council in his minority, and a precedent of this kind might be pleaded for oppression, and for the establishment of an arbitrary government, which was unsuitable to the temper of the English nation.

The return of the Protector from Scotland was followed by the meeting of Parliament, which was continued by prorogation from session to session till the last year of the

<sup>i</sup> Gardiner mentions the following syllogism of Cranmer, to prove that faith alone justifies: We are justified by faith without the works of the law; charity is a work of the law; therefore we are justified without charity. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. b. iv. p. 211.

reign. Its first concern was to repeal all penal laws against religion, among which were included the Statutes against Lollards, and the Statute of the six Articles<sup>k</sup>. But all persons who denied the supremacy of the King, or maintained the supremacy of the Pope, were liable, for the third offence, to the penalties of high treason.

A second Statute concerning religion was a penal law against speaking irreverently of the Holy Sacrament<sup>l</sup>. An intemperate zeal against popery had carried some to an excess of profaneness: from one extreme of adoration of the elements, they had proceeded to the other of contempt for the ordinance itself. The evil was too strong to be repressed by ecclesiastical censures, and it was therefore necessary to call in the assistance of the civil legislature. Fine and imprisonment were to be inflicted on all who should in future despise or depreciate this holy institution. It being more agreeable to the sense of Scripture, and the practice of the primitive Church, that the Sacrament should be received by the people in both kinds, a clause in the Statute provided, that, in future, the Communion should be ministered to all Christian people, within the King's dominions, under both kinds, of bread and wine. It was also declared to be more consonant to Scripture for the people to communicate with the priest, than for the priest to receive the Sacrament alone. Private masses were to be discontinued. But the Statute concluded, that the restoration of the ancient practice of administering the Sacrament in the Church of England should not be interpreted as a condemnation of the usage of any Church out of his Majesty's dominions.

A third Statute effected a change in the manner of electing Bishops, and transferred the election from the Deans and Chapters entirely to the Crown<sup>m</sup>. The Statute set forth, that the accustomed mode of election was tedious and expensive, and that it was only a shadow of election;

<sup>k</sup> Stat. 1 Edw. VI. c. 12.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. c. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. c. 2.

and therefore, in future, Bishops were to be created by letters-patent, by authority of which their consecration was to take place. By another clause it was enacted, that whereas, in the times of popery, the Bishops exercised their authority in their own names, they should in future carry on all ecclesiastical processes in the name of the King, from whom all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, was derived. The Archbishop of Canterbury alone was permitted to use his own name and seal for faculties and dispensations; and the collations, presentations, and letters of orders of Bishops, were excepted from the general enactment of the Statute.

The elevation of Somerset to the Protectorate had at first raised the hopes of the Reformers; but his subsequent conduct proved that he promoted the Reformation in subserviency to private interest. One great object of his administration was to secularize that portion of the monastic and collegiate property which had escaped the rapacity of Cromwell, and in the first session of the Parliament, he introduced a Bill for giving all chantries to the King.

The Bill was resisted in the House of Lords, both by the Reforming and the Romish Prelates, and Cranmer opposed it in a speech of great length. After having depicted the impoverished state of the Clergy by the sale of the appropriated tithes, which, instead of being divided among the laity, ought in justice to have been restored to the Church, he insisted that the present measure at least ought to be delayed until the King arrived at full age. By this necessary delay, the reason assigned for the dissolution of the chantries was more likely to be answered: their estates would then be applied to the improvement of the royal revenues; but, during the King's minority, their property would be alienated and wasted; and if the measure were deferred, he was convinced that the piety

of the young Prince would lead him to bestow their revenues on the parochial Clergy.

These arguments of the Primate were seconded by the Romish Prelates; for these chantries contributed to support their favourite doctrines of purgatory and masses for the dead. But the private interests of the Protector and his dependants carried the Bill through the House, notwithstanding the opposition of the Archbishop and seven other Bishops<sup>n</sup>.

In the House of Commons, the opposition was equally strong, and, as it proceeded not from religious motives, was in part successful. Some of the Burgesses represented, that the boroughs for which they served could not support their Churches and other public institutions, if the revenues of the chantries were given to the King. The Burgesses of Lynn and Coventry distinguished themselves on this occasion, and their arguments had due weight on the House. The assent of the Commons could not be obtained without a private assurance, that the guild lands, and other property of corporate bodies, should be restored, though guild lands as well as chantries were included in the Statute. There was also a provision in the Statute, that the revenues of the dissolved chantries should be converted to the maintenance of grammar schools, and the increase of vicarages<sup>o</sup>.

While the Parliament continued its session, the Convocation was diligently employed in the exercise of its deliberative functions. The Archbishop, in his address, had exhorted the assembly to adhere to the rule of Scripture, to advance the Reformation, and to abolish the remains of superstition; and, in order to prevent any

<sup>n</sup> The opposing Prelates were the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Durham, Ely, Norwich, Hereford, Worcester, and Chichester.

<sup>o</sup> Stat. 1 Edw. VI. c. 14.

restraint on the freedom of their debates, he had succeeded in obtaining a Parliamentary Repeal of the ‘Statute of the six Articles.’ In correspondence with the recommendation of the Archbishop, the Lower House unanimously agreed, that the Communion should be administered in both kinds, and they resolved to submit a petition to the Prelates through their prolocutor. The petition contained four Articles: first, that, in obedience to a Statute of the late King, the ecclesiastical laws might be reviewed; secondly, that, according to the ancient custom of the realm, the inferior Clergy might be admitted to sit in Parliament with the House of Commons, or that no Acts concerning religion might pass without their assent; thirdly, that, according to the intention of the late King, the Church Service might be reformed; and lastly, that some consideration might be taken of the destitute condition of the Clergy, and of the rigour of the Statutes on tenths and first-fruits.

The first article of the petition was received with attention; for the reformation of the ecclesiastical law was resumed, although the progress was slow: the second related to a matter which has been variously interpreted, but of which the true solution seems to be, that the Clergy were anciently a part of the House of Commons, but that their parliamentary privileges had been lost, partly through their own neglect; and that, since the submission of the Clergy in the last reign, the Commons had shown an improper interference in matters purely spiritual. The third article was granted, and a revisal of the Liturgy was begun; but the fourth article appears to have been neglected or forgotten.

Soon after the session of Parliament was ended, 1548 Gardiner, who had remained in confinement more than three months, was brought before the Council. He had addressed many letters to the Protector, remonstrating against the unjust restraint on his liberty; that

he had received his writ of summons to the Parliament, but was prevented from giving his attendance; and that such an illegal restraint on the personal freedom of one of its members might be a ground of questioning the validity of its acts. But all his complaints and remonstrances were disregarded till the Parliament had risen, when, by the general act of pardon, passed at the conclusion of the session, he was entitled to his discharge. He was dismissed with a grave admonition to obey the laws and injunctions, and he immediately departed to his diocese.

In order that the Reformation might be carried on with a proper deference to authority, a Proclamation was issued against all persons who made religious innovations, or who persuaded the people to neglect their ancient and accustomed rites. “Such innovators were to be punished by imprisonment and other penalties. To prevent the mischiefs occasioned by rash and intemperate preachers, none were to preach without a licence from the King and his visitors, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishop of the diocese, except incumbents preaching within their own parishes. Such as transgressed were to suffer imprisonment until a farther order was made for their punishment, and the magistrates were required to see that that proclamation was observed.” It was intimated, that “by placing this restraint on the sacred office, the Council only intended to repress the rash contentions of indiscreet men, and not to extinguish the lively teaching of the pure word of God. Those who obtained a licence were charged to preach sincerely, and with that caution and moderation which the time and place required; and were admonished not to excite the people to outrun their spiritual guides, whom they ought to follow, but to wait patiently till they had received instructions from their superiors.”

P Burnet’s Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. i. no. 24.

In the mean time the Committee of Bishops and Divines<sup>q</sup> appointed to reform the Offices of the Church was actively engaged, and the first Office which passed under its examination was the Sacrament of the Eucharist. This was justly esteemed the chief symbol of Christian communion, and was therefore worthy of the first care. The proceedings of the Committee were conducted with the same fairness and caution as in the last reign. The subject-matter was divided into distinct questions, to which the answer of each individual was required<sup>r</sup>, and there was a greater unanimity among the Committee than might have been supposed. That the Sacrament of the Altar was originally instituted, to be received of every man for himself, was agreed by all; but it was the opinion of some, that the receiving of one man for another was profitable, as the health of one member conduced to the soundness of the whole body<sup>s</sup>. There was a great diversity of opinion on the question, ‘What is the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass?’ The Reformers, however agreed in sentiment, varied in expression, and the Romanists with one consent maintained, that it is the presentation of the very Body and Blood of Christ being really present in the Sacrament. As it was universally agreed that the Sacrament of the Altar was instituted for every man to receive for himself, it was required to fix the period when the change was introduced for the Priest alone to receive it. The Reformers placed the innovation in the middle of the seventh century, without assigning

<sup>q</sup> The Committee consisted of the two Archbishops, and the Bishops of London, Durham, Worcester, Norwich, Saint Asaph, Salisbury, Coventry, Carlisle, Bristol, Saint David's, Ely, Lincoln, Chichester, Hereford, Westminster, and Rochester, with Doctors Cox, May, Taylor, Haynes, Robertson, and Redmayne.

<sup>r</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. i. no. 25. The document was preserved among the MSS. of Bishop Stillingfleet.

<sup>s</sup> Answer of Tonstal, Bishop of Durham, *ibid.*

any reason for the change : the Romanists, without ascertaining the period of the change, ascribed it to the decay of devotion of the people. It was generally agreed that the primitive usage should be restored, but with this reservation, on the part of the Romanists, that, if the people could not be brought to communicate, the Priest might receive alone. It was thought expedient by the Reformers to abolish Satisfactory Masses ; but the Romanists contended that they were not contrary to the word of God, and that it was lawful to receive money for saying them. It was agreed by all, that a sermon at the time of the Mass was edifying, though all were not agreed in its necessity ; but the two parties were divided on that important question, of praying in a language which was understood by the people.

Divided as the Committee was on the questions proposed for its consideration, the wise and conciliatory resolution was adopted of retaining the chief part of the Service of the Mass, but of making such additions as would convert it into a form of communion. The new Office, which may be seen in Bp. Sparrow's Collections, opened with an Exhortation to be used on the preceding Sunday or Holiday, and it contained a caution applicable to two different classes of Christians. Such as desired to make auricular confession to a Priest, were not to censure those who were satisfied with a general confession to Almighty God ; and those who were contented with a general confession, were not to be offended with those who scrupulously adhered to the practice of auricular confession.

At the time of celebration, the Priest having himself received the Sacrament, was directed to turn to the people, and read a suitable exhortation, the same that is still retained. To this succeeded a solemn denunciation against impenitent sinners, requiring them to withdraw. After a short pause, designed to allow the impenitent to retire, an admonition was addressed to the sincerely penitent, en-

couraging them to draw near. A general confession was then made, in the form still retained, and the absolution was preceded by an introduction, now omitted, asserting the power of the Church to absolve penitent sinners. The Communion was directed to be received in both kinds, and there was to be no elevation.

The Office, being finished, was introduced to the public by a Proclamation, stating, that, as an Act of Parliament had commanded the Communion to be received in both kinds, it was now to be administered according to a prescribed form. All Christians were required to communicate with due reverence, and with such uniformity as might induce the King to go on with a reformation. This was his sincere intention, and he warned his subjects against precipitance, trusting that they would respectfully and patiently wait till his designs were matured.

The new Communion Office was received with general approbation; but the conduct of Gardiner was again the occasion of complaint and censure. He had raised contentions in his diocese by publicly insulting the preachers sent thither by the Council, and had seized every opportunity of animadverting on the recent alterations. Having been frequently admonished to conform, he at length obtained permission to exculpate himself from all disaffection, in a sermon to be preached before the King. In this discourse, which was delivered before an immense audience, he had almost succeeded in raising a tumult, by his severe reflections on political as well as religious matters. He chose the festival of Saint Peter for this public exhibition, because the Gospel of the day was suited to his purpose. Many cautions had been suggested to him by the Protector and the Secretary Cecil, concerning the topics of his sermon; but these he neglected, and he was equally careless of abstaining from subjects likely to give offence, as of discussing those requisite to be enforced. On some points he expressed himself well: he fully approved the abolition

of the papal jurisdiction, and also justified the dissolution of monasteries and chantries ; he thought that images might be retained without offence, but he also thought that their removal might be attended with advantage ; he approved of the administration of the Communion in both kinds, and the discontinuance of Satisfactory Masses ; and he spoke in terms of commendation respecting the new Office of Communion. Thus far he conformed himself to the regulations prescribed to him ; but when he began to assert the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, the audience became impatient and tumultuous ; some loudly approving, and others with equal warmth condemning his doctrine. On two points of great moment, which he had been required to inculcate, he was entirely silent, those of the King's authority while under age, and the power of the Council during his minority. Any omission on the first of these points Gardiner imputed to forgetfulness in himself, or rather to want of attention in his hearers, since, in a private conference with Cecil, he asserted that he had said that the King was as much a King at one year old as at a hundred. On the second point, the power of the Council, he candidly acknowledged that he had said nothing, because he had no warrant in the Scriptures.

The delivery of this sermon decided Gardiner's present fate ; he was commanded by the Council to remain in London, and soon afterwards, having refused to give a satisfactory explanation of his conduct on some late occasions, was committed a prisoner to the Tower. His books and papers were seized, and his property was sequestered.

Gardiner being now removed from all interference in matters of Church and State, there was no impediment to the progress of the Reformation. The next formulary published for general use was a 'Catechism,' or a treatise of instruction for young persons in the grounds of the Christian religion. It was written originally in the German

language, for the use of the youth in Nuremburg, was translated into Latin by Justus Jonas, whom Cranmer retained under his roof, and was translated into English either by the Archbishop himself or under his special direction<sup>t</sup>. This treatise was not in a catechetical form, but contained a perspicuous exposition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Commandments, and the Sacraments. In this Catechism, the two first Commandments are consolidated, yet with an acknowledgment that they were anciently divided; but the use of images is strongly censured, as leading to the imputation, if not to the practice, of idolatry. Besides the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, a third is asserted, the power of reconciling sinners to God. The divine institution of Bishops and Priests is fully recognised, and the necessity of reviving the primitive discipline is strongly enforced.

The Catechism was published, with a dedication by Cranmer to the King. In his prefatory Epistle, the Archbishop complained of the great neglect of catechising which had formerly prevailed, and also stated that the rite of Confirmation had been improperly administered. None were fit to receive it, but such as had been well instructed in the principles of the Christian faith, and who with knowledge as well as with sincerity were qualified to renew their baptismal vow.

The Catechism was preparatory to a greater work, which Cranmer had long meditated, and which was now undertaken on the recommendation of the King and Council. The Committee of Bishops and Divines, already employed in forming the Communion Office, were commanded to attend the King, and were informed of the nature and extent of the proposed undertaking. This was to compose a LITURGY, comprehending an Order for Morning and

<sup>t</sup> Strype's Life of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 5.

Evening Service, together with a form of administering the Sacraments, and of celebrating all other divine offices<sup>u</sup>.

It appears that all the members of the Committee employed in the office of Communion were not retained in the reformation of the entire Liturgy, for the number was reduced to twelve, exclusively of the Primate<sup>x</sup>. Many of the Committee were scrupulously attached to the ritual of the Romish Church; and if these interfered at all in the prosecution of the work, they exerted their interference in retaining some ceremonies and devotional forms which their coadjutors would have rejected. In three of his associates, however, Ridley, Cox, and Taylor, the Archbishop found both ability and zeal to animate and assist his labours.

The great aim of the English Reformers was not to destroy, but to improve; not to depreciate the wisdom and piety of the primitive ages of Christianity, but to rescue both from the superstitious corruptions of later times: their intention was not to compose a new Liturgy, but to compare the ancient Liturgies, to select from each the most pure and edifying parts, and to incorporate them into a whole. ‘The English Prayer Book,’ Bp. Hall said, ‘was not taken out of the Mass, but the Mass was thrust out of the Prayer Book.’

As a necessary preparation for their intended work, they diligently collected the different Liturgies used throughout

<sup>u</sup> Heylin’s Hist. of the Reformation, p. 65.

<sup>x</sup> The Committee consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury; Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; Holbech, Bishop of Lincoln; Day, Bishop of Chichester; Skip, Bishop of Hereford; Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster; Ridley, Bishop of Rochester; May, Dean of Saint Paul’s; Taylor, Dean, and afterwards Bishop, of Lincoln; Haynes, Dean of Exeter; Redmayn, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; Cox, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford; and Robertson, Archdeacon of Leicester.—Wheatley on the Common Prayer. Introd. App. p. 26.

England, of which there was no small variety. In the south of England, the use of Sarum was generally followed; in the north, the Offices were modelled according to the practice of the metropolitan Church of the province, York; while the cathedral of Lincoln prescribed the rule for the middle dioceses. In South Wales, the customs of Saint David's were followed, and in North Wales those of Hereford or Bangor. There were few dioceses which had not peculiarities in their ritual; since any Prelate, famed for sanctity of life or for miraculous works, was not only canonized, but imitated in his forms of devotion: the collects and hymns which he had composed or used were retained after his death in his own cathedral. Every religious order had also its peculiar rites, and its peculiar holydays. The administration of the public offices was an art not to be learned without long study, and it constituted the chief learning of the priesthood. The superstitious customs prescribed by these Offices were of an infinite variety, and they frequently resembled the rites of paganism. All the materials of divine worship were not only consecrated by a particular form of words, but were supposed, after consecration, to possess an inherent sanctity.

Such abuses the Reformers sought to remove by removing the cause. The substitution of the English for the Latin language in the reformed Liturgy was the best guard against the introduction of superstitious practices, or the preservation of those which were already in use. The Romish Missals and Breviaries abounded with ridiculous legends, disguised under a language not generally understood, and to translate them into English must effectually expose their absurdity or falsehood.

The priesthood of the Romish Church performed divine offices in habits appropriated to their sacred function, and venerable on account of their antiquity; but, as they had been abused to superstitious purposes, it was a matter of grave debate whether or not they should be retained. It

was plausibly objected, that these habits constituted a part of the system of popery, and ought to be abolished with that idolatrous religion, and that the people supposed them to possess an innate holiness. But to this objection it was answered, that the abuse of these habits was not a valid argument against their use; since, by parity of reasoning, the objection might be applied to the use of churches, for these had been superstitiously abused. The use of the habits could be traced as far back as the fourth century, long before the corruptions of popery; and, because of their subsequent abuse, there was not a sufficient reason for abolishing a regulation which had in it so much of decency and propriety.

These preliminaries being adjusted, the Liturgy began with a form of daily service at morning and evening, the Office being nearly the same as at present, only with this difference, that it commenced with the Lord's Prayer. The Psalter was appointed to be read through monthly in portions, and the Lessons, with a little variation, are in the same order as is still in use. A Litany was also composed from the most ancient Liturgies, consisting of short petitions, interrupted by responses; but the invocations of saints and martyrs, used by the Church of Rome, were omitted, and supplications were addressed only to the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, first severally, and then jointly.

The Communion Service, which, in the preceding year, had been set forth separately, was retained with a few alterations. After the consecration all elevation was forbidden, but the people were commanded to kneel when they communicated. The doctrine of the corporal presence was still under consideration, and consequently the scriptural expressions, that the body and blood of Christ were received in the Lord's Supper by the faithful, were retained. The Prayer of Consecration was the same with that now in use, with this addition: "With Thy Holy Spirit vouchsafe

to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son."

In the Occasional Offices many ceremonies were observed, which have been since abolished as being of a superstitious tendency. Besides the use of the cross in Baptism, there was at the same time an adjuration of the devil to go out of the baptized person, and to come into him no more. A chrysome, or white vestment, was put on the newly-baptized person, as a token of innocence, and he was anointed on the head by the Priest, who accompanied the ceremony with a prayer for the unction of the Holy Ghost. The Catechism was the same as at present, except an addition on the two Sacraments, and it was repeated by the catechumens when they were confirmed. The sign of the cross was made on the forehead of each person confirmed, in addition to the imposition of hands; and, in the Office of Matrimony, the Priest, when he gave the benediction, made the sign of the cross on the forehead of the newly-married persons.

In the Visitation of the Sick, those who desired to be anointed might have the unction on their forehead or breast only, with a prayer that, as their bodies were outwardly anointed with oil, so they might receive the Holy Ghost with health, and victory over sin and death. At funerals the departed soul was recommended to the mercy of God, with a prayer that its sins might be pardoned, and that the body might be raised and glorified at the last day.

To the Liturgy was prefixed a Preface concerning ceremonies; a composition justly thought worthy of being preserved, and it still keeps its place at the beginning of the Common Prayer. In this Preface a distinction is made between ceremonies which were introduced with a good design, and in process of time abused, and those which had a corrupt origin, and were at the beginning vain and insignificant. The last kind the Reformers entirely re-

jected, but the first were still used for decency and edification. Some well-disposed Christians were so attached to ancient forms, that they would on no account suffer the least deviation, others were fond of innovation in every thing. Between these extremes a middle way had been carefully observed. Many ceremonies had been so grossly abused by superstition and avarice, that it was necessary to remove them altogether; but since it was fit to use some ceremonies for the sake of decency and order, it seemed better to retain those that were old than to invent new. Still it must be remembered, that those which were kept rested not on the same foundation as the law of God, and might be altered for reasonable causes; and the English Reformers, in keeping them, neither condemned those nations which thought them inexpedient, nor prescribed them to any other nation than their own.'

When the Liturgy had been completed by the committee, it was revised and approved by the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, or rather by a majority of these bodies, and was then submitted to the consideration of Parliament. It was first brought under the examination of the House of Commons, and received immediate assent; but in the House of Lords it continued long under deliberation. The concurrence of the Lords was not at last obtained without a protest from the Earl of Derby, the Lords Dacres and Windsor, with the Bishops of London, Durham, Norwich, Carlisle, Worcester, Hereford, Westminster, and Chichester, the three last of whom had belonged to the committee.

1549. Jan. 15.

A Statute was then passed for the use of the new Liturgy Book throughout the kingdom, and was entitled, "An Act for the uniformity of Divine Service." The variety in the forms of public worship, and the consequent irregularities, were described, but the King had refrained from punishing such disorders, believing that their authors were actuated

by an honest zeal. For their more effectual remedy, he had appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other Bishops and Divines, to draw up an Office for all the parts of Divine Service. He had enjoined those whom he had selected for the work to have a regard “to the direction of the Holy Scriptures, and the usages of the primitive Church.” This work was now finished by the persons appointed, “with one uniform agreement, by the aid of the Holy Ghost.”

The enactments against such of the Clergy as officiated “in any manner different from the rubric” prescribed by the new Liturgy were, a fine for the first offence, and imprisonment for life, with forfeiture of goods, for a contumacious refusal. A clause provided, that, “for the encouragement of learning,” the Universities might use a Latin, Greek, or Hebrew translation, of any part of the Service Book, the Communion Office only excepted.

In this manner was the “First Service Book” of Edward the Sixth established by the supreme authority. It was censured by the violent of all parties; but even their united censures were exceeded by the general approbation. The commendation, that it was effected by the aid of the Holy Ghost, was not more than just, when understood as an acknowledgment, that Divine grace, if earnestly implored, will always assist the sincere endeavours, and sanctify the imperfect actions, of man.

## CHAPTER IX.

Interference of the Foreign Reformers.—Letter of Calvin to Somerset, and of Melancthon to Cranmer.—Bucer and Fagius arrive in England, and are appointed to Theological Professorships at Cambridge.—John Alasco.—Community at Glastonbury.—Martyr is appointed Professor of Divinity at Oxford.—Disputations at Oxford and Cambridge on the Corporal Presence.—Progress of the Anabaptists and Gospellers.—Joan Bocher, or Joan of Kent.—Rebellions in various parts of England.—Deprivation of Boner.—Fall of Somerset.—New Acts Ecclesiastical.—Deprivation of Gardiner.—Consecration of Hooper, and Dispute concerning the Vestments.—Dispute concerning Altars and Tables.

WHATEVER had been hitherto effected in the Reformation of the Church of England was the work of English statesmen and English divines. During the life of Henry the Eighth, the alliance and counsel of foreign Protestant States and Churches had been proffered, but not accepted. The opinion of foreign divines had been occasionally solicited, but often they were treated with neglect, and often, after deliberation, rejected.

With the accession of Edward, a new prospect was opened to the foreign reformers, and a new era commenced in the history of the English Church. The King, being in a state of nonage, was under the tutelage of his Ministers, in ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs, and these counsellors persuaded him to accept the overtures of the most eminent divines on the continent, not only on account of their theological acquisitions, but of their political influence.

Calvin and Bullinger with promptness availed themselves of this friendly disposition. They well knew the weight of England in the Protestant cause, and were solicitous to promote an uniformity of faith, as the basis of an union in ecclesiastical government. In an address to the young

King, they submitted a project of an alliance, and offered to place him at the head of the Protestant league, and they proposed to adopt the form of episcopal government in the foreign Churches, as it had been already established in England<sup>z</sup>. If this proposition had been accepted, an impregnable bulwark would have been raised against the attacks of the Romish hierarchy.

The Genevan Reformer was acquainted with the station and the power which Somerset at this time possessed, and therefore applied himself to secure a cooperation so valuable. In an epistle to the Protector, he encouraged a farther progress in the Reformation. Although he lamented the intemperance of some who professed the Gospel, yet he complained that the English sermons were deficient in animation and energy. According to the information transmitted to him, there were two sorts of mischievous professors in England: one of these were the Gospellers, men of whim and enthusiasm, who, if not restrained, would confound all order and public settlement; the other class were addicted to the old Romish superstition. Both these classes of men ought to feel the sword of the magistrate, for they were revolters against God, as well as rebels against the King. Having thus advised the adoption of rigorous measures against such as were contumacious, he stated those abuses which demanded correction. He gave a testimony of approbation to a prescribed form of prayer, and regarded a Catechism as a necessary expedient; but he confined the rule of divine worship to the express declarations of Scripture, without any deference to the practice of the primitive Church. In the English Liturgy lately set forth, he censured the prayers for the dead, the use of the chrism and extreme unction, since (he said) they were not warranted by Scripture<sup>a</sup>. He had heard one reason assigned

<sup>z</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 15. p. 296.

<sup>a</sup> See St. James v. 14; and St. Mark vi. 13.

for the tardiness of the English Reformation, which was, that the times would not bear more; but this was to do the work of God according to political maxims: such maxims might be of use in secular affairs, but should not be followed in matters which concerned the salvation of souls<sup>b</sup>.

Melancthon prosecuted his plan of a general union among the Protestant Churches in a different spirit from Calvin. Though he did not neglect to make a direct communication to the young King, yet his chief reliance was placed on Cranmer. The Archbishop having named England as the most proper place of meeting for the heads of the reformed Churches, Melancthon readily acceded to the suggestion. He willingly offered to take a part in the deliberations of such an assembly, being alike prepared to give and to receive advice<sup>c</sup>. But all private opinion or prejudice ought to yield to truth, to the glory of God, and the good of the Church. He thought that many controversies had arisen from the use of ambiguous terms, and that nothing could so effectually silence them as precision of language<sup>d</sup>.

The epistle of Calvin had been preceded by the arrival of two confidential friends, whom Calvin had encouraged to proceed to England, on the invitation of Cranmer. Bucer had already been known for his controversy with Gardiner concerning the marriage of Priests, and was selected both by Somerset and Cranmer as a useful co-adjutor in propagating the reformed doctrines. In learning, Bucer was exceeded by none of the Reformers; in genuine piety, in zeal tempered by meekness and moderation, he

<sup>b</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. i. p. 180. Collier (Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. b. 4.) has shown that Burnet has erroneously placed the date of this letter in the preceding year.

<sup>c</sup> Τὰ μὲν πείθων, τὰ δὲ πειθόμενος. Melancth. Ep. l. i. 66.

<sup>d</sup> Melancthon says, "In ecclesiā melius est scapham, scapham dicere." Ibid.

was equalled only by Melancthon. His talents were peculiarly adapted for the communication of instruction by lectures, for he had neither the quickness nor self-possession essential to a disputant. The first invitation of Cranmer he declined, but to a second application, renewed with earnestness, he yielded.

With Bucer was associated Fagius, an able expositor of the Scriptures, and a man of deep erudition in the oriental languages. These two foreigners were received by Cranmer with his accustomed urbanity, and, on their first arrival, they formed a part of his household; but they were soon removed to a more conspicuous station, and were appointed to read theological lectures at Cambridge. As the studies of Fagius had been directed to the Hebrew language, he was the expositor of the Old Testament, and Bucer read lectures on the New Testament. Fagius began his readings on the Prophecies of Isaiah, and Bucer on the Gospel of Saint John. But their labours were soon interrupted; sickness suspended those of Bucer, and death terminated those of Fagius<sup>e</sup>.

While Cambridge was enlightened by the learning of these German divines, Oxford could boast of a character not inferior, by the appointment of Peter Martyr to the King's Professorship of Divinity. Martyr came to England in the same year with Bucer, and had long enjoyed his friendship, as well as that of Calvin. Florence was the place of his birth, where he had been an Augustinian friar; but his application to the Latin and Greek languages had excited against him the envy and hatred of his fraternity, and their hostility was increased by his adoption of the reformed doctrines. On the chief point of controversy between the Romanists and the Reformers, that of the corporal presence, his sentiments were farther removed from the Church of Rome than those of Bucer, and he expressed them with less reserve. Bucer was willing to

<sup>e</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 13. p. 282.

make use of general terms in his explanation of this grand tenet, and such as might conciliate both parties, but Martyr steadily refused such a compromise<sup>f</sup>.

Besides those foreigners whom England invited and retained in her Universities for the instruction of her youth, and for the counsel of her Prelates, several congregations of refugees were permitted to settle under the government of their respective pastors, and with the full enjoyment of their religious worship. A Dutch congregation was established in London under the superintendence of John Alasco, a Polish nobleman<sup>g</sup>, whose piety and learning were placed beyond the reach of cavil by the friendship of Erasmus. Alasco attended Erasmus in his last sickness, and possessed, either by bequest or purchase, the library of that ornament of letters. Difference in their age was no impediment to their unreserved intimacy; for Erasmus, to the end of life, retained the vivacity of youth, and Alasco, in his early years, had acquired the gravity of age<sup>h</sup>. To the high encomium of Erasmus on the personal merit of Alasco, must be added the approving sentence of Melancthon on the purity of the doctrines taught in his churches; and with such recommendations he could not fail to experience the kindness and protection of Cranmer. The interest both of the Primate and the Protector was successfully exerted in procuring for him a grant of the church belonging to the Gray Friars in London, and the Bishop of London was constituted the guardian and conservator of the privileges of this foreign congregation.

Another foreign community, consisting chiefly of French

<sup>f</sup> Strype's Eccles. Mem. vol. ii. b. i. c. 15. p. 190.

<sup>g</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 22. p. 236.

<sup>h</sup> Senex juvenis convictū factus sum melior, ac sobrietatem, temperantiam, verecundiam, linguæ moderationem, modestiam, pudicitiam, integritatem, quam juvenis à sene discere debuerat, à juvēne senex didici. Erasm. l. xix. ep. 16.

and Walloons, was founded at Glastonbury, under the patronage of Somerset, of the Secretary Cecil, and, it is presumed, of Cranmer. It was established under the pastoral government of Valerandus Pollanus, who had the title of Superintendent, and his congregation obtained a grant of some of the tenements belonging to the dissolved abbey. Pollanus had been expelled from Strasburg, together with his flock; and, for the purpose of vindicating their doctrine from misrepresentation, he published, in Latin, the Liturgy which they used: he also purposed to publish aphorisms of their discipline, and asserted that there was not a more pure Church since the time of the Apostles<sup>i</sup>.

That the influence of these foreign congregations on the Church of England was greater than it ought to have been, and that this influence was injuriously exercised, are assertions which cannot be entirely denied. But they will not apply to Bucer or Martyr, whose interference was demanded, but never officially or offensively obtruded. Their decisions were not infallible, but they sat in the chair of instruction, and therefore they “spoke with authority.”

The distinguishing tenet of the Romish Church, that of the corporal presence, had not yet been formally renounced, though in the late Liturgy it had not been asserted, and there was no obstacle to communion in the moderate of either party. Martyr and Bucer, by their academical station, were enabled to bring this tenet to the test of scholastic disputation. At Oxford the doctrine of Transubstantiation had many advocates, who were encouraged by the indulgence of the Government, by the indecisive or contrary sentiments of the Reformers, and by the lenity of Cranmer. Even the foreign Reformers were divided, and that difference was discernible in their confessions of faith. The Augsburg Confession asserted,

<sup>i</sup> Strype's Eccles. Mem. vol. ii. b. i. c. 29. p. 378.

that in this Sacrament the body and blood of Christ are present in verity, and are distributed to the faithful partakers of the Lord's Supper. [Art. 10.] The Helvetian Confession taught, that the Lord's Supper is nothing more than a sacramental commemoration of the death and sufferings of Christ. [Art. 21.] Luther seems to have agreed with the Augsburg Confession, while Calvin was inclined to adopt a middle course between the Confessions of Augsburg and Helvetia. He maintained, that in the Lord's Supper there was not only a commemoration of the death of Christ, but also a communication of His body and blood, which were not figuratively but really present<sup>k</sup>.

Before Bucer and Fagius had quitted the household of Cranmer, Martyr was established in his Professorship at Oxford, and had entered on its duties. The subject of his lectures was an exposition of that part of the eleventh chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, which refers to the institution of the Lord's Supper. He explained this portion of Scripture according to his own notions of the nature and end of the institution, but his interpretation was directly opposed to the general sense of the University. The Romanists not only contradicted Martyr in the Schools, and challenged him to a public disputation, but endeavoured unfairly to hasten the day, and to leave Martyr to contend both singly and unprepared. The first intimation given to him of the intentions of his antagonists was by the secret communication of a friend, who advised him not to appear in the Schools on that day. But such advice, however well intended, was not agreeable to the decided temper of Martyr. A desertion of the theological chair at such a crisis he justly thought would be construed into a consciousness of the weakness of his cause, or of his inability to defend it, and he resolved to proceed to the Schools with boldness. On

<sup>k</sup> Calv. Comm. in 1 Cor. xi. 24.

his way thither, he received a challenge of disputation from Smith, a Doctor of the University; but, without noticing this indecorous attack, he went on, and occupied the chair, where he displayed an equal share of courage and discretion. The presumption of Smith he gravely reprobated, and while he did not decline the proffered challenge, refused to accept it without a licence from the Privy Council. But he declared his resolution not to be interrupted on that day in the delivery of his Lecture, and the declaration had nearly occasioned a tumult. A reference was made to the Vice-Chancellor, before whom Martyr avowed that he was ready to defend any opinion which he had delivered in his Lectures, but at the same time insisted that the disputation should be managed in scriptural and not in scholastic terms.

The Privy Council having deliberately consulted on the matter, agreed that the disputation should take place, and appointed delegates to preside in it. Smith, either for his late tumultuous behaviour, or for some other cause, was obliged to find sureties for his future conduct, and then, being discharged from any future process, left the kingdom. But other advocates of the corporal presence were not wanting in the University, and the challenge of Smith was offered by Tresham, Chedsey, and Morgan. Certain conditions of a disputation were mutually agreed on, and the subject was divided into three distinct propositions: 1. In the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is no transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. 2. The body and blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally in or under the species of the bread and wine. 3. The body and blood of Christ are united to the bread and wine sacramentally.

The disputation took place before Cox, Dean of Christ Church, and Vice-Chancellor. It continued during four days, while Martyr alone combated the arguments of his three antagonists. How he acquitted himself in the dis-

putation may be known from the recapitulation of Cox, whose office as moderator led him to award a due measure of praise to the several disputants, rather than to decide to which side the victory belonged. The high ability displayed by Martyr in argumentation was thus eulogized: "Peter Martyr has established a good title to his Christian name and his surname. Peter may he well be called, for his inflexible constancy; and Martyr, for the numberless testimonies produced by him in behalf of the truth. Such as he is, he must obtain favour and respect from us, and from all good men: first, because he has taken such pains in sustaining even a burden of disputation; for if not Hercules himself could withstand two, what shall we think of Martyr against all? secondly, because he accepted the challenge, and thus stopped the mouths of vain men, who dispersed envious and odious accusations against him, as one who was either afraid or unwilling to maintain his own cause; and lastly, that he has so fully answered the expectation of the chief magistrates, and so of the King himself; while he has not only recommended to the University the doctrine of Christ, from the living fountains of the Word of God, but has not permitted others to obscure or obstruct them<sup>1</sup>."

Oxford was not the only scene of disputation on the doctrine of the corporal presence. Ridley, then Bishop of Rochester, with some others of the King's commissioners<sup>m</sup>, was sent to Cambridge, where there were public disputation on these two propositions: 1. Transubstantiation cannot be proved by the plain and manifest words of Scripture, nor necessarily collected from it, and it cannot be proved by the consent of the ancient fathers: 2. In the Lord's Supper there is none other oblation and

<sup>1</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 14. p. 287.

<sup>m</sup> The other commissioners were Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; May, Dean of St. Paul's; Dr. Wendy, the King's physician; and Cheke, his preceptor. Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. b. 4.

sacrifice than of a remembrance of Christ's death, and of thanksgiving.

On the first day Madew defended these propositions, and was opposed by Glyn, Langdale, Sedgwick, and Young; but on the second day, Glyn took the contrary side, and defended the converse of the propositions, against Pern, Grindal, Gest, and Pilkington. On the third day, Pern was respondent, Parker, Pollard, Vavasor, and Young, arguing against him. When the disputation had been sufficiently protracted, Ridley recapitulated the arguments on both sides, and concluded with an elaborate determination against the corporal presence. One argument was strongly insisted on by Ridley, which had always been urged by Wiclf, though Ridley acknowledged himself indebted to Bertramm<sup>n</sup> for its first suggestion; that the doctrine of transubstantiation was a corruption of the ninth century, and that the contrary doctrine, for nearly a thousand years, prevailed in the Church of Christ, and particularly in the Church of England<sup>o</sup>.

These public disputations in the Universities were the natural consequence of a previous disputation in a place less fitted for its discussion. The subject in the preceding Session had been debated in Parliament<sup>p</sup>, though no record of the debate has been preserved.

<sup>n</sup> The famous antagonist of Pascarius Radbertus, Abbot of Corby. Charles the Bald ordered Bertramm and Johannes Scotus to draw up a clear and rational explanation of the Eucharist. The treatise of Scotus has perished, that of Bertramm is still extant. Fabricius, Biblioth. Lat. tom. i. p. 49.

<sup>o</sup> In the language of one of the Saxon Homilies: "Much is betwixt the body Christ suffered in, and the body hallowed to housell (i. e. the Sacrament), this latter being only His ghostly body gathered of many cornes, without blood and bone, without limb, without soule, and therefore nothing is to be understood therein bodily, but all is to be ghostly understood." Published by Archbishop Parker. See Lewis's Life of Wiclf, c. vi. p. 90.

<sup>p</sup> There was a notable disputation of the Sacrament in the Parliament

While the English Prelates were thus engaged in a laborious and dispassionate investigation of a fundamental tenet of the Church of Rome, their attention was imperiously called to the irregular proceedings of a sect of reformers, who had already excited rebellion in Germany, and had found their way into England. This sect, generally called *Anabaptists*, was divided into two kinds, of which the milder species was comparatively harmless. The moderate Anabaptists held that Infant Baptism was of no validity, that this Sacrament ought not to be administered but to such as were of an age capable of receiving instruction; they referred to the example of Christ, who commanded His disciples to teach all nations, before baptism; and they attributed the decay of Christian piety to the baptism of children before they could understand the meaning of the ordinance. Whatever may be thought concerning the soundness of their arguments, the moderate Anabaptists were not deserving of punishment: but there was another and a dangerous kind of fanatics known by the same appellation. They denied the necessity and propriety of Infant Baptism, but they also adopted many other peculiarities. The mysteries of the Trinity, of the Incarnation and Atonement, of the fall of man, and the aids of grace, were, in their judgment, philosophical subtleties, and not doctrines revealed in the Scripture. Their renunciation of all the principles of Christianity was accompanied by a spirit fierce and cruel, which had burst forth into a general rebellion throughout Germany.

Among the other fugitives who had escaped from the rustic war, excited by the German Anabaptists, many of its promoters, suffering the consequences of their own turbulent spirit, sought an asylum in England. A complaint was laid before the Council, that they were busy in disseminating their errors, and in gaining proselytes. In conse-  
House. King Edward Sixth's Journal, year 2d. See Burnet's Hist.  
Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 8.

quence of this representation, a commission was issued to several Bishops and Divines, authorizing them to search after and examine all Anabaptists, heretics, and contemners of the Book of Common Prayer. Such delinquents the Commissioners were first to endeavour to reclaim, to enjoin them penance, and give them absolution; but, in case of incorrigible obstinacy, to excommunicate, imprison, and finally to deliver them over to the secular power. The opinions commonly maintained by these sectarists may be ascertained from the abjurations which some were prevailed to make, and they were to the following purport: 'that a man regenerated cannot sin;' 'that though the outward man sinned, the inward man sinned not;' 'that there was no Trinity of persons in the Godhead;' 'that Jesus Christ was nothing more than a holy Prophet, and not, in any sense, God;' 'that all the benefit which men obtained by the mission of Christ was His teaching them the way to heaven;' 'that He took not flesh of the Virgin;' 'and that the baptism of infants was unprofitable.'

There was another class of religionists, which was not distinguished for holding erroneous tenets, but for the abuse and perversion of such as were true. They were called Gospellers, or readers of the Gospel, but were a scandal to their Christian vocation<sup>q</sup>. So profligate were their morals, that they called forth the most severe expostulations, and the most heavy denunciations of Divine vengeance from the eloquent preachers of the times<sup>r</sup>. The doctrine of Predestination having been generally maintained by the Reformers, the Gospellers deduced from it the most

<sup>q</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. i. p. 233.

<sup>r</sup> "What a swarm of gross Gospellers have we also among us, which can prattle of the Gospel very finely, talk much of the justification of faith, crack very stoutly of the free remission of all their sins by Christ's blood, avance themselves to be of the number of those which are predestinate unto eternal glory, &c. but how far doth their life differ from all true Christianity!" Becon's Preface to Jewel of Joy.

unwarrantable inferences; concluding that, since every thing was decreed by God, and that, since the divine decrees could not be frustrated, therefore it was vain or impious for man to resist. This perversion was the cause in some men of impiety, and in others of despair. Luther, who began with an unqualified assertion of the doctrine of predestination, and a denial of free-will, lived long enough to see the practical effects of these tenets; while Melanethon was decidedly adverse to the doctrines themselves. Calvin and Bucer, though they taught that the decrees of God were absolute and irrespective, were careful in admonishing the people against drawing unfair and dangerous consequences from this truth. The divine decrees are among “the secret things of God:” it was therefore useless to search into mysteries which could never be penetrated, and it was extremely hazardous to make these secret counsels the rule of conduct.

The Commissioners appointed to examine and to reclaim the Anabaptists and Sectarians performed the duty with forbearance as well as fidelity. The attempt was made by public controversy, and by private conference, and speaking generally, the Reformers were averse from propagating even truth by violence. That there are exceptions to this assertion, it is impossible to deny; exceptions the more conspicuous, because they are rare; and they have been studiously displayed, in order to show that the Protestants, when the sword was placed in their hands, were not less inclined to persecute than the Papists. One of these exceptions was the execution of Joan Bocher, or Joan of Kent; a proceeding which is not only a blot on the Reformation, but on the personal character of Cranmer. To obliterate it is impossible, and to extenuate it is injudicious, unless by the candid acknowledgment, that the principles of religious toleration were not then fully understood<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> It now appears, that the whole of this story, which probably originated with Foxe, is a fabrication. The writ upon which Joan Bocher

This unfortunate woman was cited before the Commissioners, for reviving part of the Valentinian heresy, and denying that Christ was incarnate of the Virgin Mary. It was not without many ineffectual efforts to convince her, that Cranmer at length delivered her over to the secular power, after having condemned her as an obstinate heretic. The sentence being reported to the Council, the King was moved to sign a warrant for her execution ; but his repugnance was not easily overcome, and Cranmer, whose powers of persuasion were acknowledged, was employed to remove the scruples of the young Prince. The Archbishop argued from the law of Moses, by which blasphemers were commanded to be stoned, even by their nearest relatives ; and made a distinction between errors on speculative, doubtful, or indifferent points, and a denial of the vital and essential doctrines of Christianity. His arguments tended to silence but not to satisfy the King. Edward at last signed the warrant with tears in his eyes, expressing a passionate wish that he had never learned to write, and at the same time imposing on the Archbishop the responsibility of the transaction. The behaviour of the King impressed Cranmer deeply, and the execution of the sentence was suspended ; he joined with Ridley in an endeavour to convince her of her errors ; but she was not only impenetrable to their arguments, but contemptuous in her replies<sup>t</sup>. When brought to the stake, Scory, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, was appointed to preach a discourse in confutation of her heresy, but she interrupted him in the most intemperate language, and persisted in her contumacy even to death<sup>u</sup>.

was executed was not signed by the King at all. See Biog. Notice of Roger Hutchinson, printed by the Parker Society. Ed.

<sup>t</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. iii. p. 161. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 2. p. 49.

<sup>u</sup> Burnet and Neal have represented Joan Bocher as insane ; but Strype gives a different account. Eccles. Mem. vol. ii. b. i. c. 25. p. 335.

During the time when the Commissioners were employed in suppressing the extravagancies of sectarists, insurrections of a formidable nature took place in various parts of the kingdom. No measure connected with the Reformation had produced so great a change in the political state of England as the dissolution of the monasteries. While the abbeys stood, numbers were maintained solely by their bounty; while their lands were leased on moderate terms, and their tenantry gained a comfortable subsistence. But the individuals to whom the abbey lands had been alienated, were obliged by no vows to perform acts of charity, and were not under the control of public opinion. Marriage being now universally allowed, the population had greatly increased, while the means of subsistence were diminished. Several of the nobility and gentry, being willing to improve the monastic property which had been conveyed to them, had enclosed a considerable portion of waste lands, and though the enclosure was an ultimate benefit to the country, it was an immediate benefit only to the proprietors. An Act for enclosing and imparking grounds had been carried through the House of Lords, and, although rejected by the Commons, the practice was continued, not in defiance of any existing law, but without legal authority.

The Protector, in opposition to the Council, espoused the cause of the commonalty: he published two proclamations, one against all enclosures, and another indemnifying all who had transgressed the law by destroying them, on condition of future obedience. Thus encouraged by the countenance of the Protector, discontent soon assumed the form of a regular and dangerous rebellion. In Kent, Oxfordshire, and Sussex, it was quickly suppressed; but in Devonshire and Norfolk the rebels were not only numerous but well organized, and, notwithstanding the distance of these two counties, appeared to act in concert.

In Devonshire, a county remote from the Court, and

addicted to the Romish worship, the rebels appeared in great force, and acquired strength from the supineness and timidity of the Government. Under the command of Humphrey Arundel, a gentleman of Cornwall, they besieged the city of Exeter, and proposed terms of submission. Their demands were chiefly that the religious establishment should be altered, and the Romish worship restored, and the articles on which they consented to capitulate were sent to the Council. Cranmer was commanded to answer these articles, and, in compliance with his instructions, enlarged on each with his accustomed perspicuity, and with great strength of argument defended the separation of the Church of England from the superstitious and idolatrous worship of the Church of Rome. The purport of the answer was a refusal of all the demands so insolently pressed, and an exhortation to return to unqualified obedience.

Awed by the firmness with which their demands were resisted, the rebels moderated their tone, but persisted in proposing conditions; and they were met a second time in a different manner than they had been answered by Cranmer. An address was issued in the name of the King, in which, after expressing an affection for his people, he charged the malcontents with rebellion against him in defiance of the laws of God. The address stated, that the people were abused by their Priests, and that the changes of which they complained had been made after a long and impartial deliberation. The address was expressed in peremptory terms, and, after an invitation to return to their duty, concluded with a warning, that, in case of obstinacy, they might expect the most rigorous treatment. But the inflamed multitude, led on by their Priests, having in vain attempted to take Exeter by force, resolved to reduce the garrison by famine. The inhabitants suffered the greatest extremities till the siege was raised, and the rebels defeated, by the Lords Russel and Grey.

While the rebellion in Devonshire was at its height, another equally alarming raged in Norfolk. Religion was not here made the pretext; but the professed aim of the rebels was to destroy the nobility and higher orders, and to place new counsellors about the King. They were headed by one Ket, a tanner, and though undisciplined, their irregular sallies spread consternation. Ket assumed to himself the right of judicature, and under an old oak, hence called the "oak of reformation," administered justice to his adherents. The Sheriff of the county came boldly among them, and exhorted them to disperse; but a precipitate retreat alone preserved him from their fury. Parker, the second Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, in a more pacific guise, ventured to remonstrate with them; but though his intrepidity and his sacred function commanded their respect, yet his oratory was unavailing. The Marquis of Northampton, with a small armed force, was compelled to retreat, after sustaining a serious loss, and the honour of quelling the insurrection was reserved for the Earl of Warwick. Ket was taken, and, with some of the principal insurgents, suffered his merited punishment.

Boner had not been a careless observer of these commotions, and was not without reason suspected of fomenting them. Since his release from confinement, he had opposed all the measures of the Reformers, while under discussion; but if they were enacted by law, his obedience, though constrained, was punctual. Yet the manner in which he executed the orders of the Council was calculated to bring them into contempt, and he had shown particular remissness in dispersing copies of the new Service Book, and enjoining its use throughout his diocese. After having received many admonitions for his negligence, he was, like Gardiner, commanded to preach on an appointed day, and the matter of his discourse was prescribed. Injunctions were given that he should preach against rebellion,

and on the power of the King during his minority : but he converted his discourse into a defence of the corporal presence, mingled with censures on those who opposed the doctrine, and was either silent on the topics prescribed for discussion; or treated them in such a manner as to raise dissension. Informations were laid against him by two of his hearers, and a commission was issued to Cranmer and Ridley, the two Secretaries of State, and May, the Dean of St. Paul's, with full powers to suspend, imprison, or deprive him.

By a court thus questionably constituted, Boner was not only deprived of his Bishopric, but was, during the trial, sent to prison, and, by the sentence of the Commissioners, his imprisonment was continued during the royal pleasure. Coarse in his manners, and brutal in his temper, he was not deficient in acuteness, and on many points in the examination gained a decided advantage over his judges. If his deportment were insolent and unbecoming, and if his language were intemperate<sup>a</sup>, they were met by equal bitterness. It is universally acknowledged that he disgraced his sacred function, and dishonoured any party to whom he attached himself; but his total unfitness for the episcopal office bears hard on the discrimination of his first patrons, Cromwell and Cranmer, or their discernment must be vindicated at the expense of their integrity.

It was not without reluctance that the court proceeded to a sentence, whose severity was confessed, and whose legality might be disputed. Boner received promises of favour, on condition of submission; but he excepted both against the authority of the Commissioners and the justice of the sentence, and appealed from the delegates to the

<sup>a</sup> "Three things I have (to wit) a small portion of goods, a poor carkass, and mine own soul: the two first ye may take (though unjustly) to you, but as for my soul ye get not, *Quia anima mea in manibus meis semper.*" Acts and Mon.

King in person. It is scarcely necessary to add, that his appeal was rejected.

The Norfolk and Devonshire rebellions, which had tended to the crimination of Boner, also prepared the way for the fall of Somerset. Contrary to the advice of a majority of the Council, he had proclaimed a general amnesty; but his moderation was interpreted into a partiality for a democratical government. He had studiously gained popularity, which he had converted into an instrument of private aggrandizement, and his spoliation of ecclesiastical property had alienated the friendship of the Reformers. Ridley had successfully resisted his attempt to plunder the University of Cambridge, and Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, had openly arranged himself on the side of Somerset's enemies. The opposition against his measures in the Council became so strong, that he was deprived of his exorbitant power, and reduced to an equality with the other members of the Board. To the loss of influence succeeded loss of liberty; articles of impeachment were exhibited against him, in which he was accused of violating the conditions on which he was raised to the Protectorate, of entering into treaties, and of conferring places of trust and emolument without the consent of his colleagues.

Somerset could bear his fall with greater equanimity than he had borne his elevation. While he was imprisoned in the Tower, he applied himself to study, and meeting with a Treatise on Patience, recommended both by philosophic and Christian arguments, he procured its translation into English, and published it with a preface, written by himself. Peter Martyr wrote to him a long epistle of consolation, which was thought worthy to be published in the original Latin, and in an English version.

Cranmer, who had shown too great flexibility to the aspiring views of Somerset, did not desert him when his power was at an end, but laboured to avert his downfall.

The Romanists could not conceal their joy at the event; for the Earl of Warwick, who was expected to succeed Somerset in power, though not in station, had given them private assurances of his favour<sup>x</sup>. Gardiner sent to him a congratulatory letter, rejoicing that the late tyranny was overpast, and calling the attention of the new minister to the indignities suffered by one of the Prelates of the Church. Boner addressed a petition that his appeal might be received, and the process against him reversed. Many who, through fear or interest, had complied with the late changes, now refused to join in the Liturgy, or to hold communion with the Church.

Whatever hopes might have been entertained by the Romanists were quickly disappointed, or whatever promises had been given by the Earl of Warwick were completely falsified. His ambition was perhaps greater than that of Somerset, and he was totally devoid of principle. He soon perceived, that the only way of preserving the favour of the young King was by expressing an abhorrence of the corruptions of popery; and whatever his real sentiments might have been, he succeeded in disguising them. The congratulations of Gardiner were left unanswered; the petition of Boner was indeed taken into consideration, but his appeal was dismissed.

The succeeding Session of Parliament and Convocation was employed in the completion of the Liturgy. An Act was passed to call in the old Missals and other Service Books, that there might not be any diversity of opinions or ceremonies, and to remove all images out of churches<sup>y</sup>. But an Act of greater consequence related to a new Ordinal, or a form of Ordaining “Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and other Ministers of the Church<sup>z</sup>.” The Statute was passed, after a protestation by five of the Bishops, viz. Durham, Carlisle, Worcester, Chichester, and Westminster, by

<sup>x</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. i. p. 286.

<sup>y</sup> Stat. 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 10.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. c. 12.

which the work was committed to the management of six Prelates and six Divines, to be appointed under the Great Seal.

The committee assiduously applied themselves to prepare the Ordinal, with the exception of Heath, Bishop of Worcester, who, on a refusal to consent to the alterations, was, after being summoned before the Council, sent to the Fleet. In the reformed Ritual, all ceremonies were abolished which had nothing to recommend them but empty pomp, and which might be abused to purposes of superstition. The only form of Ordination mentioned in Scripture was that of imposition of hands, accompanied by prayer, and therefore the additions of later ages were abolished. In the Consecration of Bishops, the gloves, the sandals, the mitre, the ring, and the crosier, were omitted ; and in the Ordination of Priests, it was no longer thought expedient to use unction, or to deliver the sacred vessels employed at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The only Orders which the English Ritual acknowledged were Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ; those being of Apostolical institution, and the others the addition of modern ages. The distinction between the two higher Orders of Bishops and Priests is preserved in the ordinal of Edward. In the Consecration of Bishops, there is an express declaration, by two Bishops, that the person presented is one of their own Order. There are more questions demanded of him by the Archbishop, or presiding Bishop, some of which suppose a superior authority in his character, and that the exercise of discipline and the government of a diocese are peculiar to the Episcopal function. The Consecration of a Bishop is performed by at least three of the Episcopal Order ; whereas the Ordination of a Priest is performed by one Bishop, with the assistance of Priests. But neither of the Orders is accounted valid, unless received from a Bishop : the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are all conferred by Episcopal authority.

The first Bishop consecrated by the reformed Ordinal was Poinet, who, on the promotion of Ridley to the see of London, succeeded to the vacant see of Rochester. Poinet is not so well known in the history of the English Church as his station demands and his merits deserve. He was educated at Cambridge, where he was honoured by the friendship of Ridley; and that friendship, which was never bestowed unworthily, is a sufficient refutation of the calumnies, eagerly disseminated by the Romanists against his memory. His writings, both in Latin and English, are an extant monument of his learning; while biography records his critical knowledge of Greek, and the fluency with which he spoke the German and Italian languages. His extraordinary skill in mathematics had introduced him to the notice of Henry<sup>a</sup>, and his eloquence in the pulpit gained him the favour of Edward.

A few months elapsed, and Poinet was translated to the see of Winchester; for it yet remained to dispose of Gardiner, who had continued two years a prisoner in the Tower. His imprisonment, without any trial, was highly arbitrary and illegal; and his deprivation will not admit of any excuse from the necessity of the case. With justice he complained that articles of doctrine were brought to him, while in confinement, for subscription, and that he was thereby prevented from a fair discussion of the agreement of these articles with Scripture. He put in a compurgation, by which he endeavoured to show, that the accusations against him originated in malice. Like Boner, he appealed from the Commissioners to the King in person: but his judges proceeded to a sentence of deprivation, and, like Boner, he was imprisoned during the King's pleasure.

Even the advancement of Ridley and Poinet was not

<sup>a</sup> Henrico Octavo dicitur horologium fecisse, quod non solum horas vulgares ostenderet, sed dies etiam mensis, mutationes lunares, et fluxūs atque refluxūs maris tempora. Godwin de Præsulibus, p. 299.

sufficient to protect the deprivation of Gardiner or Boner from censure, which the impoverished condition of the important Bishoprics of London and Winchester tended to increase. An annual revenue of one thousand pounds was the inadequate stipend allotted to Ridley and Poinet for their support, while the property of their Bishoprics was sequestered, and subjected to a temporary secularization.

If these proceedings excited the censures of the enemies of the Church, another event occurred which caused a schism within it. The promotion of Hooper to the Bishopric of Gloucester was the source of a contest, attended with such fatal consequences, that we may say of it, "How great a matter hath a little fire kindled<sup>b</sup>!" Hooper was a Student and a Graduate of the University of Oxford; but left England to avoid persecution under the Statute of the six Articles. He resided at Zurich during the remainder of Henry's reign; but on the death of that Prince returned to his native country, strongly prepossessed in favour of the doctrines and the ecclesiastical government of the Zuinglian Churches. The Duke of Somerset appointed him Chaplain to his household, and the fortunes of Hooper did not decline with those of his first patron, for he succeeded in the favour of Somerset's rival, the Earl of Warwick. His diligence in the pastoral office, and his reputation as a preacher, gained the countenance of the Court, and, in conjunction with Poinet, he was appointed to preach the Sermons in Lent before the King. His elevation to the Episcopate obtained the cordial assent of Cranmer and Ridley: they knew his popularity as a preacher, and they knew the efficacy of preaching in promoting the Reformation.

To the acceptance of a Bishopric, under the existing policy, Hooper entertained strong objections. It appears that one of his scruples related to the oath of supremacy,

<sup>b</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. i. p. 314.

and that he excepted against the following clause, “ by God, by the Saints, and by the holy Gospels.” This form, in his judgment, was impious, and he argued before the King in council, that to God alone man ought to appeal in an oath, for God alone knew the heart of man. The young King was so powerfully affected by this argument, that he erased, with his own hand, the obnoxious words from the oath<sup>c</sup>.

But the other scruples of Hooper were not so easily satisfied, because they were less reasonable. It has been already related, that the vestments used in the Church of Rome were retained in the Church of England, and Hooper refused to be consecrated in the proper episcopal habit. This refusal he justified by arguing, that ‘these vestments were unsuitable to the simplicity of the Christian religion ; that they were relics of Judaism ; that they belonged to the ceremonies which Saint Paul had condemned as beggarly elements ; and that they had been superstitiously consecrated, and used in the idolatrous service of the mass.’

Cranmer had neither liberty nor inclination to gratify the singularities of Hooper ; and having refused to proceed to the consecration, persisted in his refusal, though the Earl of Warwick solicited the King to grant a dispensation, discharging him from all penalties to which he might have been otherwise liable<sup>d</sup>. Ridley, in a conference with Hooper, contended, that ‘although traditions in matters of faith were justly rejected, yet custom was a good argument for the continuance of rites and ceremonies. Saint Paul condemned those Jewish ceremonies, which some would have retained by virtue of the authority of the Mosaic law ; but their observance, without the recognition of that law, he not only approved, but practised. The superstitious use of the sacerdotal vestments

<sup>c</sup> Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. iv. p. 389.

<sup>d</sup> Collier’s Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. iii. p. 377.

was not a better reason for their discontinuance, than the demolition of churches, or the removal of bells, because the one had been consecrated, and the other baptized, with many superstitious ceremonies.'

Unwilling to trust his own judgment, Cranmer referred the question to Bucer, and Bucer submitted it to Peter Martyr. These two foreigners, though their prepossessions were against the use of the vestments, and though their practice was suitable to their prejudices, decided against Hooper, and concluded that the vestments might be lawfully worn. Their arguments had little weight with Hooper, for he had the support of Bullinger and Alasco, and he not only refused to yield, but indulged himself in censorious invectives against the customs of the Church.

For his incompliance, and still more for his declamations in the pulpit against the established regulations, he was first silenced, then confined to his house, and finally committed to the Fleet. At length the dispute was terminated by a compromise, and he was consecrated on these conditions: that at Court, or in his cathedral, he should wear the attire which the other Bishops used; but that in all other places he should be permitted to exercise his discretion with respect to his apparel<sup>e</sup>. This termination was undoubtedly disgraceful to Hooper, since it was a tacit acknowledgment, either that he had pursued a long and fierce contention for a matter confessedly indifferent, or that he had at last submitted to a compliance which was sinful. With a deportment repulsively austere, he was remarkably ambitious of popularity, and, with apparent humility, he was not devoid of ostentation. It

<sup>e</sup> "Bishop Hooper was constrained to appear once in public, attired after the manner of other Bishops, which, unless he had done, *some think* there was a contrivance to take away his life; for *his servant told me*, that the Duke of Suffolk sent such word to Hooper, who was not himself ignorant of what was doing." Fox's *Acts and Monuments*. This passage requires no comment.

is not, therefore, surprising that his conduct on this occasion should have lowered him in the public esteem; for while the first violence of his opposition was odious, his subsequent concession rendered him contemptible.

In the affair of the vestments, Hooper not only failed to impose his opinion on the Church, but was himself brought to conformity. In another point he appears to have gained the concurrence of the other Prelates: disregarding the practice of antiquity, he seized the opportunity, in a sermon preached before the King, to suggest, that "the magistrate would do well to turn the altars into tables, according to the first institution of Christ; that by this expedient the people would be cured of a false persuasion, which they had of a sacrifice to be done on the altars; and that while altars remained, both ignorant people and ignorant priests would always dream of sacrifice."

Ridley coincided, if not entirely, yet in a great measure, with this suggestion, and in his injunctions to the Clergy of his diocese, commanded that the altars should be converted into tables, in order to turn the people from the superstition of the Popish Mass to the right use of the Lord's Supper. He directed that the table should be placed in such a part of the choir or chancel as was most convenient, so that the ministers and communicants might be separated from the rest of the people, and that all side altars should be removed. To show his own sentiments on this matter, and that, while he discountenanced superstition, he was not less averse from unauthorized novelties, he suffered the table in his own cathedral to stand in the place of the ancient altar, but removing the partition behind it, laid the choir open to the east. This arrangement was according to primitive custom: for the altar or table was placed in the middle of the chancel or choir, and the Bishop with his presbyters had their seats behind it.

<sup>1</sup> Bingham's Antiq. of the Christian Church, l. viii. c. 6. s. 11.

The injunctions of Ridley were given in obedience to an order from the King and Council, but that order experienced the decided resistance of many Prelates. Day, Bishop of Chichester, and Heath, Bishop of Worcester, were deprived of their sees, for nonconformity in this matter, and were not only deprived, but after deprivation were imprisoned in the Fleet. Their release from prison was not a restoration to entire freedom, for Day was committed to the Bishop of Ely, and Heath to the Bishop of London, who were ordered by the King to use the deprived Prelates as charity and discretion should suggest<sup>g</sup>.

The altar controversy having been afterwards unhappily renewed, will be discussed at greater length. The subject will be closed here by observing, that the superstitious use of the Lord's Supper, and the custom of private masses, rendered the alteration now adopted highly seasonable. How common, as well as how pernicious the abuses of this holy rite were, may be understood from the following passage in our excellent Homily on the "Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ:" "We must then take heed, lest of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest of two parts, we have but one; lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive<sup>h</sup>."

## CHAPTER X.

Bucer's Animadversions on the Common Prayer.—His Death and Character.—Second Service Book of Edward VI.—Psalmody.—Articles of Religion.—Second Catechism of Edward VI.—*Reformatio Legum.*

IN order to mark the progressive steps by which the Church of England attained its final settlement, the his-

<sup>g</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 20. p. 330.

<sup>h</sup> Second Book of Homilies, Hom. xv. part 1. p. 410.

torian is induced to pause at the epoch at which he is now arrived. By reverting to the advancement already made, he will perceive that much remained to be accomplished. He will be compelled to acknowledge, that the Reformation was complete only in respect to the separation of England from the see of Rome, but that there was not an adequate form of ecclesiastical polity substituted in the room of that which, for wise reasons, had been abolished.

There were undoubtedly Homilies set forth by public authority, but they were insufficient for the purposes of instruction and edification: their compilation was dictated by the ignorance and superstition of the priesthood; and their use would be, in a great measure, superseded by the extemporaneous addresses, or the premeditated compositions, of a Clergy competently learned. In contradistinction to the Romish priesthood, a reformed Clergy would be a preaching Ministry.

In the next place, there was an authorized Liturgy; but the first Service Book of Edward was far from satisfying even its composers: many useless and superstitious ceremonies were injudiciously retained, and it was not until after a careful revisal that "the Mass was cast out of the Prayer Book." There was also a Catechism; but it was unsuited to popular instruction, considered as a manual for the unlearned and young, or as a guide to the Christian of more liberal education, and of riper age.

All that had been attempted, either with regard to the Homilies, the Liturgy, or the Catechism, only proved the necessity of attempting more, and many parts of the system had been as yet untouched. As yet there was no Confession of faith, although the foreign Protestant Churches had long since laid down a standard of doctrine, and prescribed their terms of communion. As yet there was no ecclesiastical code, but the reformed Church of England was governed by the pontifical law, corrected by the

discretion of the judge, or restrained by the regal prerogative.

These deficiencies were not overlooked by Cranmer, and by those Prelates and Divines who shared his confidence and concurred in his views. Their plan of reformation was equally wise in its design and execution, and they provided remedies for those wants which were imminent and urgent. They began with a review of the Liturgy, because errors or defects in a public form of worship are of all others the most dangerous, and the most difficult of correction. At the desire of Cranmer, the first Service Book had been submitted to the criticism of Bucer and Martyr; Alesse having translated it into Latin for the use of Bucer, while Martyr was furnished with a version by Cheke<sup>i</sup>."

Assisted by the communications of Calvin, and the advice of Martyr, Bucer digested his Animadversions on the Service Book in the form of a treatise, which he divided into twenty-eight chapters. In his prefatory epistle to the Archbishop, he made a candid acknowledgment, that, after a careful perusal of the Liturgy, he had found nothing in it which was not founded on the word of God, or which, if interpreted fairly, was contrary to the Scriptures. Yet, after having made this concession, his exceptions were numerous; and though they were in many instances hypercritical, and in others groundless, they received from the English prelacy a candid and careful examination.

As to Bucer himself, he lived not long enough to see how far his suggestions were adopted; and if the fact be added, that he had not arrived in England when the first Service Book was finished, and that he died before the review of the second, a judgment may be formed of the extent to which the English Liturgy is indebted to Bucer.

<sup>i</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 28. p. 381. and Wheatley on the Common Prayer, Introd. App. p. 27.

Far be it, however, from the historian to pass over, with frigid indifference, the character of a man whom his contemporaries have praised with the warmth of kindred genius. His high merit may be estimated from the honours paid to his memory by those who disagreed with him in religious sentiment, as well as from the regret expressed by those who were united to him by personal friendship and similarity of opinion. By the direction of Cranmer and Sir John Cheke, he was buried with the highest academical honours: the Vice-Chancellor, and all the Graduates of the University, with the Mayor and Aldermen of the town, attending the funeral in solemn procession. Haddon, the University Orator, composed a Latin speech in his praise, and pronounced it with a pathos which drew tears from the whole assembly. Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, then Master of Corpus Christi College, described his character, and lamented his death, in an English discourse. Redmayn, the learned Master of Trinity College, in a Sermon delivered before the University, pronounced an appropriate and discriminating eulogy. After having commended the sweetness of temper for which Bucer was remarkable, Redmayn observed, that they had differed in many things, especially in their notions of justification, and the influence of divine grace: but as Bucer had satisfied his doubts in many points, so he believed that if death had not separated them, they might have agreed on many more, and he knew no man alive from whom he could learn so much as he had learned from Bucer. The memory of this learned foreigner was honoured by more than barren praises: he died in extreme poverty, leaving no other property than his library; but private liberality and the royal bounty were exercised towards his widow. The stipend of the Professorship was paid to her for some time after the death of her husband, and the chair was not filled. Cheke informed the University, of which Bucer had been so great an ornament, that

the King would endeavour to provide a successor, but one equal to Bucer could scarcely be found<sup>k</sup>. Melancthon was once more invited to England, with an offer of the station which Bucer had adorned<sup>l</sup>; but the invitation was declined, and the loss of Bucer was irreparable.

When the Book of Common Prayer was submitted a second time to the review of the English Prelates and Divines, the Animadversions of the foreign reformers concentrated in the treatise of Bucer, were dispassionately considered. Calvin had mentioned the English Liturgy with disrespect in his letter to the Protector; and in his epistles to Bullinger, and even to Cranmer, he treated the whole English Reformation with contempt. The objections of Bucer may therefore be considered as the objections of Calvin: that they were received with due attention is certain, but it is equally certain that they were not followed with implicit submission. While the Service Book was under a revisal, Cranmer intimated to Peter Martyr that many alterations were concluded, but what these corrections were Martyr was ignorant, and he dared not assume the liberty to inquire<sup>m</sup>.

Before any alterations in the Liturgy are noticed, it is proper to notice the change made, in the second Service Book, of the place appointed for reading the Morning and Evening Prayer. Divine Service was always performed in the choir or chancel, and the first Service Book of Edward, in concurrence with primitive custom, directed that the Priest should still officiate in the choir. His station was near the altar, towards which, whether standing or kneeling, he always turned his face in the Prayers, though, while he was reading the Scriptures, or addressing the

<sup>k</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 24. p. 357.

<sup>l</sup> Strype's Eccles. Mem. vol. ii. b. i. c. 29. p. 383.

<sup>m</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 16. p. 301. and Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. b. 4. p. 425.

congregation, he turned to the people. Against this practice Bucer, by the direction of Calvin, strongly objected, urging that it was a most antichristian custom for the Priest to say prayers only in the choir, as a place peculiar to the Clergy, and not in the nave among the people, who had as much right to divine worship as the Clergy themselves. He therefore strenuously insisted, that to read Divine Service in the chancel was an insufferable abuse, and ought immediately to be amended, if the whole nation would not be guilty of high treason against God<sup>o</sup>. These remonstrances, of whatever value they might be, prevailed so far, that, in the second Service Book, the Morning and Evening Prayer were directed to be sung or said in such part of the church or chancel as the people might best hear, and the Minister was so to turn himself as he might be heard most conveniently by the people. (*See Rubric before the Morning Prayer in King Edward's Second Book.*)

Calvin had less success in his cavils against the separation of the chancel from the church, than in his objections against the celebration of Divine Service in the chancel; though it was Bucer who inveighed with the greatest vehemence against the separation. He called it an antichristian practice, tending only to gain an undue reverence for the Clergy, who would thereby seem to be more nearly related to God than the laity; he also asserted, that the primitive churches were built in a round form, and that the place for the Clergy was always in the middle, and that the division of the chancel from the church was another article of high treason against God. But this objection received no greater attention than it deserved; for, instead of an order to demolish all chancels, as was expected, a clause was added at the end of the first rubric to prevent any alteration, enjoining

<sup>o</sup> Bucer. Cens. c. 5. p. 457.

that "the chancels should remain as they had done in times past."

Another great source of contention was not only concerning the two names of altar and table, but concerning the position of the table, and in what part of the chancel or church it should stand. Difference of opinion on this point caused a correspondent diversity of practice. In some churches the table remained in its ancient place, in others it was removed into the church; in some places it stood altar-wise, or north and south, and in others like a common table, east and west. The rubric of the second Service Book so far complied with the objections of Bucer, that the table was enjoined to stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer were appointed to be said; but the table was still to stand altar-wise, because the Priest, or the principal minister, was directed to stand at the north side of the table; an injunction which could have no significance, if the table were not placed north and south.

The ministerial habits which the first Service Book had enjoined, but which had excited the displeasure of Calvin and of Bucer, among the foreign divines, and of Hooper, at the head of no inconsiderable number of English dissentients, were not altogether abolished, but were rendered more simple. The rubrics prescribing the use of the ancient habits were omitted, and the following direction substituted: "The Minister, at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall have neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but, being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a Priest or Deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

The corrections in the body of the Liturgy were numerous, and for the most part executed with judgment. The daily Morning and Evening Service began with the Lord's Prayer; but now this commencement was thought abrupt. Prayer requires so much attention and composure of mind, that it

can never be well performed without some preparation<sup>p</sup>, and therefore it was thought that some well-chosen sentences of Scripture might be useful in producing this self-recollection. A short Exhortation was introduced to apply the preceding sentences, and to prepare the way for a general confession of sins. This was consonant to the practice of the primitive Christians, who, immediately on entering the house of prayer, made confession of their sins to God, every man pronouncing his own particular confession with his own mouth<sup>q</sup>. The English Reformers intended, that those who uttered the Confession should not content themselves with a bare recital of the words, but should mentally join with the words a confession of their private sins to God. But if the public form had been more particular and express, it would not so well have answered the general end for which it was designed.

The congregation having thus humbled themselves before God, a general Absolution, or a declaration of pardon, was to be pronounced by the Priest, in the name of God, to all who joined sincere repentance with unfeigned faith. The form of this Absolution is declaratory and conditional; which, without giving up the power of the Priesthood to bind or loose, is more suitable to the nature of divine worship than the absolute and unqualified pardon given to penitents after confession by the Church of Rome<sup>r</sup>.

As the Daily Service was supplied with an appropriate Introduction, the Communion Office was improved by a similar addition. It was found that the people often came to this holy ordinance without due seriousness and preparation; and for the purpose of awakening the conscience, the Communion Office of the revised Liturgy began with the Lord's Prayer, and a Collect for purity. The last

<sup>p</sup> Wheatley on the Book of Common Prayer, c. iii. p. 120.

<sup>q</sup> Basil. ad Cler. Neocæs. ep. Ixiii. secundūm nov. ord. ccvii.

<sup>r</sup> See the Absolution in The Vis. of the Sick, Comm. Prayer.

Collect was not new, for it was in the oldest Offices of the Western Church, but it was now inserted in this place, as a fit preface to the Decalogue. The divine precepts of the Moral Law being not less obligatory on Christians than on Jews, the Ten Commandments were to be solemnly pronounced by the Priest standing, and turning himself to the people; and a pause was to intervene between each Commandment, that the people might implore pardon for their past transgressions of every particular precept, and grace to observe it in future. The insertion of the Decalogue in the Communion Office is an innovation, not only on the Romish Missal, but on every other ancient Liturgy, and is a peculiarity of the English Church; but it is an innovation of which the propriety is evident. It was the best method that could be devised, under the existing relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline, to excite penitence, and induce self-examination<sup>s</sup>.

The other alterations occurred principally in the Occasional Offices of the Liturgy, and in the Rubrics of the Communion Office. The posture of kneeling at the time of receiving was retained, and an explanatory rubric was added, that by this posture was not intended any adoration of the bread and wine, but only a reverential acknowledgement of the mercies of God in the death of Christ. In the Occasional Offices, some rites which savoured of superstition were either formally abolished, or their practice was no longer enjoined. The use of oil, and of the cross, in Confirmation; the Romish sacrament of extreme unction; the practice of exorcisms, and of repeated crossings at Baptism; the prayers for departed souls, both in the Burial and Communion Office, were all expunged from the Second Service Book.

A principle was now attempted to be established, which, if acted on to its full extent, would have totally changed a material part of divine worship, that of Psalmody. A

\* See Palmer's Orig. Lit. vol. ii. p. 27.

provision had been inserted in the Statute for the Uniformity of Divine Service<sup>t</sup>, making it lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories, as in other places, to use openly any Psalms or Prayer, taken out of the Bible, at any time, so that it were done without impediment or omission of the Service Book. This clause, if it were not designedly inserted, was ostensibly used for the purpose of sanctioning a version of the Psalms in rhyme.

The use of Psalms and Hymns in Divine Worship was sanctioned by the example of Christ Himself, and was distinctly recommended by His Apostles. That it was adopted by the primitive Christians is certain, and the testimony of Pliny is not only decisive as to the fact, but as to the mode of singing. It was *amabæan*, or in the form of antiphone; for that this was the meaning of Pliny<sup>u</sup> is proved from Saint Basil, who relates, that after confession the congregation proceeded to singing Psalms, and, dividing itself into two parts, sang by turns<sup>x</sup>.

Magnificent were the commendations bestowed by the Fathers on sacred music. Augustin testifies of himself, that it elevated his affections, and occasioned a pleasure rapturous and refined. It was intended to assist human infirmities, since harmony takes hold of the mind, and makes its way, where a bare recitation of the words would never enter. He freely acknowledges that sounds have an ascendant over the mind, and that where they are suited to the occasion, the effect is favourable to piety.

But sacred music, like every other divine gift, is liable to abuse; and its abuse gave rise to a doubt concerning its lawfulness. Augustin himself, who expatiated so eloquently on its power and utility, seems afraid to trust his passions with so fascinating a pleasure, and commends the plainer method of singing practised by Athanasius in

<sup>t</sup> Stat. 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 1.

<sup>u</sup> "Secum invicem." Plin. Ep. lib. x. ep. 97.

<sup>x</sup> Basil. ad Cler. Neocæs. ep. lxiii, secundūm nov. ord. ccvii.

the church of Alexandria. This Bishop directed the Psalms to be sung with a moderate inflection of voice, so as to resemble reading rather than singing<sup>y</sup>.

The Church of Rome, attentive to the external splendour and impressiveness of divine worship, had bestowed uncommon care on the regulation of Psalmody. It was the subject of a Canon, at a Synod under Pope Gregory the Great, and the Gregorian chant was celebrated for its pathos.

The foreign Reformers, fixing their attention on the abuses of sacred music, and observing the excessive and scrupulous solicitude with which the art was cultivated in the Romish Church, applied themselves, with better intentions than judgment, to reduce it to greater plainness. To moderate the time consumed in this part of divine worship was an object of their concern, where they could not entirely banish it from their religious assemblies; and the Helvetic Confession [s. xxiii.] contains a censure on the Gregorian chant, and a commendation of its rejection by many of the Protestant Churches.

The Church of England, in the reign of Edward the Sixth, was too much guided by foreign influence, to prevent a tendency to assimilation with the customs of foreign Protestants; and a Statute of this reign contains a condemnation of the antiphone. Yet, while an absurd law stigmatized all refinement in music, and while a corrupt taste repudiated harmony as sinful, a gross violation of simplicity and nature was committed by countenancing a new metrical version of the Psalms. An attempt had already been made to translate the Psalms by Clement Marot, groom of the bedchamber to Francis the First<sup>z</sup>; and Sternhold, who occupied a similar station in the household of Edward the Sixth, applied himself to the

<sup>y</sup> Augustin. Confess. b. x. c. 49, 50. ‘ut pronuncianti vicinior esset quam canenti.’

<sup>z</sup> Heylin’s Hist. Ref. p. 127.

same undertaking<sup>a</sup>. The translation of Marot was used in those French churches which were reformed after the model of Geneva, and that of Sternhold was chiefly approved by those English who affected the Genevan discipline and worship.

The performance of Sternhold, though it professed to be allowed by authority, was never sanctioned, either by the Crown or the Convocation, and it was opposed by the private judgment of many great Prelates<sup>b</sup>. They justly feared that the introduction of this barbarous translation might captivate the ignorant, and lessen their regard for the other parts of the Liturgy; and experience proved that their apprehensions were founded on a knowledge of human nature.

The second Service Book of Edward suffered a material injury from this vitiation of devotional feeling. In the first Common Prayer Book, before every Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, a Psalm was prefixed, appropriate to the Sunday or Holyday. It was appointed to be sung or said while the Priest made his entrance within the rails of the altar, and, from this circumstance, derived its common appellation of "introit." The use of introits to begin the Communion Service was known in the Christian Church before the time of Jerome<sup>c</sup>, and their propriety is as unquestionable as their antiquity is undisputed. According to the first Liturgy, while the whole Psalter was read through every month, in the Morning and Evening Service; the most edifying parts were repeated on Sundays, and the other solemn days observed by the Church.

Before the established Service Book could be legally superseded by the revised Liturgy, the sanction of Par-

<sup>a</sup> Sternhold translated only thirty-seven Psalms: the rest were done by Hopkins, and others. Those marked with the initials W. W. were done by one William Wisdom.

<sup>b</sup> Heylin's Animadversions on Fuller's Church History, p. 119.

<sup>c</sup> Durand. Rational. l. vi. c. 2.

liament was requisite. In the next Session, which did not take place until after a prorogation of two years, an Act was passed for the uniformity of the Common Prayer, and the administration of the Sacraments<sup>d</sup>. An honourable testimony was given to the first Service Book, in the Act by which it was abolished, that it was formed on the doctrine of the Scriptures, and the practice of antiquity. But, because many doubts had arisen concerning the form of Divine Service, which proceeded rather from "the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers than from any worthy cause, the King had commanded the Book of Common Prayer to be faithfully perused and made perfect." By the same Act, the Ordinal for making Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, was annexed to the Bill, and was enacted to be of equal force with the Book of Common Prayer.

As the first Service Book was not established without a strong opposition in the House of Lords, so the revised Liturgy called forth a protest, and the Earl of Derby, the Bishops of Carlisle and Norwich, with the Barons Stourton and Windsor, recorded their dissent<sup>e</sup>.

When the Liturgy had been completed and established by the authority of Parliament, and when it was found that the majority of the Prelacy was favourable to the Reformation; then, and not before, was the opportunity arrived to prepare a national confession of faith. It was a work which had been already accomplished by the other  
1536 reformed Churches. Sixteen years had elapsed since  
the Helvetic Confession had appeared, at a time when an expectation of a General Council was prevalent,  
1530 and more than twenty years had expired since the  
Germanic Princes presented their Confession to the Emperor, Charles the Fifth, at the Diet of Augsburg. It was the opinion of many, that a Confession of faith

<sup>d</sup> Statute 5 and 6 Edward VI. c. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Journals of the House of Lords.

should have been the first step in the Reformation of the English Church, since the order would be more natural that the Articles should precede the Liturgy, and that the Liturgy should be framed in harmony with the Articles. Bucer had often urged on Cranmer the necessity of the undertaking; but Cranmer wisely postponed it until he could secure the unanimity of the chief pastors of the Church. He thought justly, that the most pernicious errors were those which corrupted the purity of divine worship; errors which were of general concernment, and of practical import. Articles of faith necessarily comprehended a variety of speculative points on which unanimity could not be expected, and it was preferable that these questions should be thoroughly ventilated in disputation and controversy, before they were determined by authority, and imposed as Articles of faith. These were the reasons which had induced Cranmer to delay the work; but these reasons were now counteracted by others which it was impossible to resist.

The long-expected General Council of Trent<sup>f</sup>, which the Emperor had urged with repeated and importunate solicitation on Clement and his successor, was, in consequence of the same instigation, convoked by Julius the Third. Its early deliberations, under Paul the Third, instead of reconciling differences between the Papists and Protestants, had widened the breach, and made it irreparable. Having begun by examining the chief point in controversy between the Church of Rome and the Reformers, concerning the rule of faith, the Council had decreed by its infallible authority, that the Apocryphal Books were of equal authority with those which were received by the Jews and primitive Christians into the sacred canon; that the traditions handed down from the Apostolic age, and preserved in the Church, were entitled

<sup>f</sup> The first session was held the 13th Dec. 1545; and the last the 2d Dec. 1563.

to equal regard with the doctrines and precepts which the inspired authors had committed to writing; that the Latin translation of the Scriptures, made or revised by Saint Jerome, and known by the name of the Vulgate translation, should be read in churches, and appealed to in the Schools as authentic and canonical. The decision on these points was a plain intimation to the Protestants what judgment they might expect, when the Council should take into consideration the particular and subordinate Articles of their Creed.

When the Council was renewed under the pontificate of Julius the Third, the Emperor had promised, in a Diet previously assembled at Augsburg, that he would use his utmost exertions towards the promotion of moderation, impartiality, and charity, in the approaching representative assembly of the Christian Church. The Protestant Churches, distrusting his professions, prepared for the events which they foresaw. The Saxons employed the pen of Melancthon, and the Wurtemburgers that of Bredtius, to draw up Confessions of their faith, which were to be laid before the Council.

England, which had declined to participate in the Council of Trent, had also refused to adopt the Confession of Augsburg. At this crisis, therefore, it was expedient that the Creed of the Church of England should be ascertained and promulgated, that the grounds, both of its separation from the Church of Rome might be clearly known, and also of its dissent from the doctrine and discipline of the Reformed Churches.

The undertaking was begun by Cranmer, in pursuance of an order which he received from the King and Council, to draw a book of Articles for preserving the peace and unity of the Church; and the outline of the system is supposed to have been executed by the hand of the Primate himself. This imperfect sketch was submitted to the examination of those Prelates and Divines who

enjoyed the confidence of Cranmer; and common fame has particularized Ridley and Cox as his chief associates. No farther progress was made until the ensuing year, when the Council demanded from the Archbishop <sup>1552</sup> the Articles which he had been enjoined to prepare. They were accordingly sent, but were soon returned to their author, who digested them into a better method, distinguished them by titles, and added a few supplemental passages where they were too short<sup>g</sup>.

After this second revisal, Cranmer presented the Articles to the King, praying that they might be promulgated with the sanction of his authority. This sanction was delayed, till they had been submitted to the inspection, not of the most profound divines, but of the most popular preachers. A letter was directed by the King to Harley, Bill, Horn, Grindal, Perne, and Knox, requiring them to peruse these Articles, and to make a report of their opinion<sup>h</sup>.

In what manner the Articles were received by such referees it is impossible to say; but the Archbishop received them again from the Privy Council with an injunction to give them a third review, and to bestow on them "the last corrections of his judgment and his pen<sup>i</sup>." The Archbishop, having made some farther remarks, enclosed the Articles in a letter to the Privy Council, soliciting that the Bishops might be authorized to receive the subscription of the Clergy within their respective dioceses. If this measure were adopted, such a harmony in religion might be expected to follow as could not otherwise take place for a number of years<sup>j</sup>.

When the Articles were submitted to the Convocation, it does not appear that they were introduced for the purpose of discussion, but only of receiving the subscription

<sup>g</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. iv. p. 427.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid.

<sup>j</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, Appendix, No. lxiv. Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. iv. p. 407.

of its members. The title of the Articles induces a supposition that they had been agreed on in Convocation, and the inference is probable, that the two Houses had transferred their authority to a Committee, and that the Committee assented to the Articles in the name of the whole Convocation. There is no doubt, however, that they emanated from royal authority. The King sent a mandate to the Archbishop, both to publish the Articles, and to cause them to be subscribed; and although the mandate itself has not been preserved, yet the certificate of its execution by the Archbishop is still in existence. In the Archiepiscopal Injunction to the Bishop of Norwich, which has been also preserved, all the Clergy were required to subscribe before their admission to any benefice or cure<sup>k</sup>.

In addition to the evidence from the registers of Canterbury, an Injunction from the visitors of the University of Cambridge remains, purporting that, as the Articles had been promulgated by royal authority, and delivered to all the Bishops for the better government of their dioceses, they enjoined, by virtue of their visitatorial authority, all Doctors, and Bachelors of Divinity, and all Masters of Arts, publicly to subscribe the Articles before admission to their degrees, and that, in case of refusal to subscribe, the degree for which the candidate supplicated should be denied<sup>l</sup>.

It belongs to the present work to consider the Articles with respect to their history rather than their substance; but a few remarks on their subject-matter cannot be deemed unseasonable, and can be scarcely called a digression. These Articles constitute the basis of the Articles set forth by the authority of Convocation in the reign of Elizabeth, and still adopted as the Confession of faith in the Church of England.

The framers of the English Articles appear to have

<sup>k</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. iv. no. 8.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. no. 9.

examined the other Protestant Confessions of faith then in existence, but not to have adopted them implicitly, or even to have followed their method and arrangement. The English Confession, when compared with the Helvetic, the Augsburg, or the Saxon, differs in its form: it is strictly dogmatical, and not, like these foreign Confessions, argumentative or parenetic. The Helvetic Confession having been framed in consequence of the expectation of a General Council, and the Saxon having been drawn up in an interval between the Sessions of the Council of Trent, had a particular reference to the controversial points discussed and determined in that assembly. The English Confession, while it freely declared its sense on the authority of General Councils, of Tradition, and of the Holy Scriptures, in opposition to the decrees of the Council of Trent, was principally designed to condemn some popular errors at this time current in England.

On those abstruse points of metaphysical theology, which at this period distracted the peace of the Christian Church, the English Confession has preserved a moderation peculiar to itself, differing from the Augsburg Confession, which on some of these points has preserved an entire silence. Original sin is defined to be the inherent corruption of all the descendants of Adam, in opposition to the Pelagians and the Anabaptists: (these last were omitted in the Articles of Elizabeth.) On the subject of free-will it agrees with the Augsburg Confession, and the Erudition of a Christian Man, in asserting that, although man has such a natural free-will that he may perform acts of moral obedience and legal justice; yet without preventing and co-operating grace, he has no power "to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God." But lest the influence of Divine grace should appear inconsistent with the free agency of man, a caution is added, that "the grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost," offers no violence to the human will. No man can excuse his sins by alleging that

he is constrained to sin, and therefore is not liable to condemnation. This Article (X.) is omitted in the Articles of Elizabeth.

On the doctrine of Predestination, which the Augsburg Confession has altogether omitted, and which the Necessary Erudition has treated with the same censure of its discussion, the English Confession has been more explicit. (Art. XVII.) Personal election is clearly maintained, but not that absolute, irrespective election, which is taught in the Helvetic Confession<sup>m</sup>. The progress and completion of election are by the following gradations: a divine call, obedience to that call, gratuitous justification, adoption, conformity to the Divine image, practice of good works, and, finally, everlasting felicity. But, to prevent all fruitless and impious inquiries, a caution is subjoined, that the doctrine of Predestination, however consolatory and useful to the spiritually-minded, is highly dangerous to the carnal. It is generally an unprofitable subject of contemplation, and it is always an unsafe rule of conduct.

In this manner was the doctrine of the Church reduced to a short and plain form, happily avoiding the subtile distinctions of schoolmen, and the peremptory tone of controversialists. If some points of "doubtful disputation" could not be entirely omitted, in compliance with the clamour of the times, yet they are treated with such temper and moderation, that the Articles may be conscientiously subscribed by men of opposite opinions<sup>n</sup>.

The Articles were intended to regulate the belief and preaching of the Clergy, but a summary of the Christian faith was still wanted for the use of the people, and that deficiency was supplied by "The Second Catechism of King Edward." It was the last authorized formulary in

<sup>m</sup> Deus ab æterno predestinavit vel elegit liberè et merâ suâ gratiâ, nullo hominum respectu, sanctos quos vult salvos facere in Christo... Helv. Con. s. x.

<sup>n</sup> Fuller's *Moderation of the Church of England*, c. vi.

this reign, whence it may be fairly understood to contain, as far as it goes, the ultimate decision of the Reformers, and to represent the sense of the Church of England as then established<sup>o</sup>. It was in effect a public work, its examination having been committed to “certain Bishops and other learned men.” Yet although it was submitted to the revisal of many, in the language of the prefatory injunction, it was “written by a certain godly and learned man.” Who this individual was it has not been ascertained, although Poinet, Bishop of Winchester, has the best claim to the distinction; but whoever might be its author, Cranmer recommended it to the notice of the King, and consequently to public use<sup>p</sup>. It was printed both in English and Latin, and was enjoined to be taught in schools, as a sequel to the other brief Catechism set forth in the beginning of this reign.

The Second Catechism of King Edward differs from the first in its form, for it is in question and answer. This, as the formulary itself asserts, is the plainest way of teaching, which not only Socrates used in philosophy, but Apollinarus adopted in religion. A dialogue is the preferable mode of instruction, both for perspicuity and brevity.

The sum of the Christian religion is reduced in the Catechism to two points: true faith in God, and an assured persuasion of all those things which are contained in the holy Scriptures; and charity, which belongs both to God and our neighbour. The Creed, or symbol of the Christian’s belief, is stated to be an abridgment or sum of the divine commands, and therefore the Decalogue is rehearsed and explained before the Creed. The divine law was engrafted by God in the nature of man, while nature was yet sound; but, by original sin and evil

<sup>o</sup> Bishop Randolph’s Preface to King Edward’s Catechism in the *Enchiridion Theologicum*, vol. i. Oxf. 1825.

<sup>p</sup> Strype’s Mem. of Cranmer, b. ii. c. 34. p. 422.

custom, the image of God was so darkened in him, that of himself he did not understand the difference between right and wrong. God therefore, to renew this image, gave to man a written law, that he might see as in a glass the weakness and corruption of his nature, and thereby be inclined to lay hold on a Saviour and His atoning merits. No man is made righteous by the law, for no man is able to fulfil the law.

After the Decalogue follows an explanation of the Creed, by which Christians attain a knowledge of their duty, and the Catechism then defines the true service of God to consist in hearing the Gospel, in the use of the Sacraments, and in prayer. The Sacraments are reckoned two, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. The Lord's Prayer is prescribed as the model of our devotions, and a short paraphrase of it succeeds. The manual concludes with some excellent practical directions given to the scholar by the master or catechist.

If Poinet were the author of this Catechism, the merit of this single production is sufficient to rescue his other writings from oblivion. It undoubtedly passed the revision of Ridley, whose commendation was expressed in strong but not in extravagant terms. He has given the highest and the best testimony in favour of this, and of the other labours of the Reformers in the reign of Edward, which has the weight not only of a deliberate but of a dying attestation.

" This Church of England hath of late, of the infinite goodness and abundant grace of Almighty God, great substance, great riches of heavenly treasure, great plenty of God's true sincere word, the true and wholesome administration of Christ's holy Sacraments, the whole profession of Christ's religion truly and plainly set forth in Baptism, the plain declaration and understanding of the same taught *in the Holy Catechism* to have been learned of all true Christians. The Church had also

a true and sincere form and manner of the Lord's Supper, wherein, according to Jesus Christ's own ordinance and Holy institution, Christ's commandments were executed and done. . . . . This Church had of late the whole divine service, all common and public prayers ordained to be said, and heard in the common congregation, not onely framed and fashioned by the true vein of Holy Scripture, but also set forth according to the commandment of the Lord, and St. Paul's doctrin, for the edification of the people in their vulgar tongue.. It had also holy and wholesome *Homilies* in commendation of the principal virtues which are commended in Scripture, and likewise other Homilies against the most pernicious and capital vices, that use, alas ! to raign in this realm of England. This Church had, in matters of controversie Articles so penned and framed after the Holy Scriptures, and grounded upon the true understanding of God's word, that in short time, if they had been universally received, they should have been able to have set in Christ's true religion, and to have expelled many false errorrs and heresies wherewith this Church, alas! was almost overgon <sup>q.</sup>"

One part of the reformed system remained to be established, although brought to a completion, that which related to the government of the Church. A code of ecclesiastical law had long engaged the attention of Cranmer, and he had laboured to accomplish his design at the commencement of his primacy. In that Statute, which recited the submission of the Clergy, a reform of the whole body of the Canon Law was provided, and even in the reign of Henry a commission had been appointed, in pursuance of the Statute, and some progress had been made in the undertaking. After the Statute of the six Articles, the work was suspended, but not formally abandoned; for Cranmer often urged its necessity, and made an extract of

<sup>q.</sup> Farewell of Ridley, in Fox's Acts and Monuments.

certain passages from the pontifical code to convince Henry that it ought not to be studied any longer in England<sup>r</sup>.

At the beginning of the present reign, a commission was appointed, consisting of thirty-two persons, and three years were allowed for the accomplishment of the work. But it was still retarded by various impediments, until at length, to facilitate its execution, a sub-committee was chosen of eight<sup>s</sup>, who were to prepare the code for the revisal of the thirty-two commissioners. The sub-committee, like the body whence it was elected, was divided into four classes, Bishops, Divines, Canonists, and Common Lawyers<sup>t</sup>. From the finished state of the "Reformatio Legum," it is probable that the labours of the sub-committee had been reviewed and approved of by the commissioners: it was ready to be submitted to the King; but, before it could receive the royal confirmation, the King died, and the project died with him.

The work consequently is not, and never was, of any authority; but still it is a valuable record, and throws a clear light on the views of the Reformers. It is not only a decisive evidence of their plans with respect to canonical jurisprudence, but of their opinions on Christian doctrine. It was not printed till the reign of Elizabeth, but it was the work of this reign, and consequently ought to be placed here.

The "Reformatio Legum" is introduced by the two commissions of Henry the Eighth and Edward the Sixth,

<sup>r</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. i. b. iii. no. 27.

<sup>s</sup> These eight were, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Ely, in the first class; Dr. Cox and Peter Martyr, in the second; Dr. May and Dr. Taylor, in the third; and John Lucas and Richard Goodrich, in the fourth. The Bishop of London was substituted for the Bishop of Ely; and Bartholomew Traheron, afterward Lecturer of Divinity to the English Church at Frankfort, was chosen in the room of Goodrich.

and they are followed by a preface<sup>t</sup>, unfolding the plan of the work, and giving an account of its authors. Though Cranmer did not execute the whole, yet he gave an impulse and direction to the abilities of his colleagues<sup>u</sup>, and the result of his diligent superintendence, as it is displayed in the work itself, justifies the character given of him, that he was the greatest canonist in England. It was originally written, or at least the greater part, in English; but Haddon, the King's Professor of Civil Law at Cambridge, was employed to translate it into Latin<sup>x</sup>. Haddon most probably availed himself of the assistance of Cheke<sup>y</sup>, and these two translators imitated the style of the Pandects, with a felicity which cannot be found in the decrees of Gratian.

After the account which has been given of the introduction of the Canon Law, a curiosity is excited to learn the notions of the Reformers on ecclesiastical jurisprudence. The necessity of such a code, and the decay of ecclesiastical discipline, occasioned by its absence, were topics on which the foreign Protestants strongly insisted. Calvin was loud in his complaints on the profligacy and impiety of the times, which he invariably attributed to the laxity of the pastors of the Church in enforcing spiritual censures. Bucer, in the year of his death, had dedicated to the King his book, "On the Kingdom of Christ;" a treatise written with great ability, and offering useful suggestions on civil and ecclesiastical polity. Many parts of this treatise were incorporated in the "Reformatio Legum."

<sup>t</sup> The preface is marked by the initials J. F. The edition of 1641 is here quoted; but there are two editions of prior date in the Bodleian Library.

<sup>u</sup> Summæ negotii præfuit Thomas Cranmerus, Archiepiscopus Cantuar. Præf. Reform. Legum.

<sup>x</sup> Orationis lumen et splendorem addidit Gualterus Haddon. Ibid.

<sup>y</sup> Quin nec satis scio an Johannis Checi viri singularis eidem negotio adjutrix adfuerit manus. Ibid.

The new ecclesiastical code was digested into fifty-one<sup>2</sup> Titles, to bring it to a similarity with the number of the books contained in the Pandects of Justinian. The two first Titles, "Of the Trinity and the Catholic Faith," and, "Of Heresies," are of the greatest importance, since they relate to Christian doctrine. They are, in fact, a comment or gloss on the Articles of Religion, and a commentary of undisputed authority, because supplied by the composers of those Articles.

The first Title, "Of the Trinity," corresponds with Article 1. [Tit. I. cap. 2.] those who denied the Christian religion were to suffer death, with loss of goods. The books of Scripture are enumerated [Tit. I. cap. 6.], and the apocryphal books are distinguished from the canonical; and though the former were allowed to be read in the church, yet it was only for instruction, and not for the establishment of any article of faith. The power of the Church is subjected to the rule of Scripture, [Tit. I. cap. 10.]; the four first General Councils are admitted to be orthodox, but all Councils are to be guided by the rule of Scripture, [Tit. I. cap. 14.] The writings of the Fathers, though deserving esteem and reverence, are to be submitted to the same scriptural test.

Such is the scope of the first Title, and in it are recited many of the articles on the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The second Title, "Of Heresies," is, if possible, more valuable, because it illustrates those articles which are of a controversial kind. It is divided into twenty-one chapters. The seventh chapter, "On Original Sin, Free Will, and Justification," is nearly a literal transcript of the Articles on those abstruse points, [Art. 8, 9, 10.] The eleventh chapter almost verbally agrees with the Article entitled, "Everlasting Salvation to be obtained only through the Name of Christ," [Art. 18.] The ninth chapter bears the title, "Of the falling away of those who

<sup>2</sup> There are fifty-two in the ed. of 1571.

are justified, and of Sin against the Holy Ghost," and it resembles, or rather is an enlargement of, the Article, "Of Sin after Baptism," [Art. 16.] It condemns the common opinion, that those who have been once justified cannot fall into sin, or, if they commit any act contrary to the laws of God, that God will not impute it to them as sin. But the converse of this error is not less severely censured, that every wilful sin committed after baptism is not to be pardoned, as being a sin against the Holy Ghost.

The twenty-second chapter of the *Reformatio Legum*, "On Predestination," is not only a confirmation of the Article on that subject, [Art. 17.] but clears any obscurities in its language. It opens with a complaint, that "many, professing to be members of the Church, men of vain curiosity, of profligate lives, and destitute of the Spirit of God, have made the subjects of predestination and reprobation the theme of their conversation." Maintaining, "that God has made an absolute decree concerning the salvation or perdition of every individual, such men have found a cover for their impieties and crimes. If their pastors remonstrated with them on the flagitiousness of their lives, they referred all their guilt to the will of God, and charged their wickedness on Him, until, at last, they were led by the devil, either into despair, or into a dissolute and luxurious security, ["securitas," translated, "wretchedness,"] without repentance, or even a consciousness of their crimes. These two evils, of despair and security, though of a different nature, lead to the same termination." The abuse of the doctrine of predestination having been thus pointed out, its true meaning is defined, after diligent and careful examination. "The godly consideration of our predestination or election, which was determined of God before the foundations of the world, leads to a mortification of carnal desires, elevates the mind to heavenly things, excites gratitude towards God, impels to good works, and draws us away from works

which are evil. It also lessens arrogance and confidence in our own strength." But an admonition is given, "that predestination cannot be pleaded in extenuation of sin, for God cannot appoint or decree in any matter that which is unjust, nor does he ever constrain our wills, or thrust us into sin against our own inclinations. For this reason all Christians are to be warned never to refer their undertakings and actions to the decrees of predestination. They should rather accommodate their conduct to the laws of God, since they perceive that the Scriptures propose, in general terms, promises to the good, and threatenings to the wicked. Therefore it is our duty to follow that will of God, which is plainly revealed to us in the holy Scriptures."

Thus, while the seventeenth Article is entirely silent concerning reprobation, the twenty-second chapter of the "Reformatio Legum" directly alludes to this error, and alludes to it only to pronounce its condemnation as a deadly heresy.

The third Title relates to the manner in which heresy was to be punished. The trial was to proceed by the examination of witnesses; but the party accused might avail himself of compurgation. If he repented of his heresy, he was required to make a public profession of his repentance in those places where he had spread his errors. Obstinate heretics were to be declared infamous, and incapable of public trust; of being witnesses in a court of justice, and of making a will. Clerks falling into heresy were to be deprived of their benefices. The fourth title related to blasphemy, which was to be punished in the same manner as heresy.

These were some of the laws to guard the purity of Christian doctrine; but there were others of a civil, or of a mixed nature. The laws of matrimony, adultery, and divorce, were entirely altered. In the first place, all the canonical regulations with respect to precontracts and

espousals were abrogated. But to prevent the evil consequences which might arise to young women who yielded to the solicitations of designing men, the penalty of excommunication was denounced against the offenders; and in case of refusal to marry any woman whom they had seduced, they were to forfeit to her a third part of their goods. The marriages of minors and orphans, if contracted without the consent of their parents and guardians, were declared void; but in case the parents or guardians refused consent without a just cause, the ecclesiastical judge was to decide concerning the propriety of the union. All marriages were prohibited between persons related within the Levitical degrees; for the Levitical law in regard to marriage was declared to be obligatory on all Christians. It was consequently impious for the Roman pontiff to dispense with the prohibitions of the law of God. [Tit. ix. cap. 3.]

The greatest innovation, and perhaps the greatest improvement, on the pontifical law, was on the subject of divorce. Separation *a mensa et thoro*, unless pending a trial, was entirely abolished, as being productive of great abuses and scandal in the marriage state. This kind of separation was grounded on the principle of the indissolubility of the marriage tie; while it favoured the dissolution of marriage with respect to every purpose of its institution. [Tit. x.]

Purgation was allowed by the Reformed code, and the manner of it was prescribed. It was allowed only in case of strong presumptions; for when there was legal proof of a crime, there was no room for purgation. Clerks who were convicted of any crime in the temporal courts, were not to be admitted to purgation in the spiritual. All superstitious purgations, though supported by ancient custom, were to be done away, such as duels, hot iron, or hot water. [Tit. xiv. cap. 21.]

Many of the titles relate to the internal economy of the

Church, and especially to the regulations of divine worship. Wills were still subjected to the ecclesiastical judicature, and an article which gave rise to contests between the temporal and spiritual courts was adjusted. Breach of faith was considered in the pontifical law as a moral offence not less than a civil injury. The reformed code determined that breach of faith, whether on a matter of spiritual or a secular nature, was under the cognizance of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Whatever agreements or promises were not performed, in all cases where an oath was taken, or even a solemn affirmation was made, the offenders might be pursued with ecclesiastical censures, and compelled to make satisfaction to the parties who were deceived by their perfidy.

Excommunication was still retained, as a power granted by God to the Church for removing scandalous or corrupt persons from its communion. This power of the keys was granted by Christ Himself; and the end of it is to maintain the authority of the society, to strike terror into delinquents, and to bring them to reformation. Spiritual censure was not to be used, unless in cases of extremity; in great crimes, such as strike at the root of all religion, or are a flagrant violation of morality. A whole society or corporation was not liable to excommunication, because in all collective bodies there is a variety of individuals, and it is not right that the innocent should suffer for the guilty. As excommunication was not to be applied to light offences, so it was never to be pronounced without due solemnity. It was desirable that the consent of the whole provincial Church should intervene; but, since that was impracticable, the ecclesiastical judge, when he passed sentence, was to be assisted by three neighbouring priests, besides the minister of the parish where the delinquent lived, and also by a justice of the peace. When sentence had been pronounced, it was to be notified in the parish church where the offender lived, and also in the neigh-

bouring parishes. If the excommunicated person continued forty days under the censure without repentance, his contumacy was to be certified to the Court of Chancery, and a writ was thereupon to issue for his imprisonment, until he made his peace with the Church. [Tit. xxx.]

On a review of the "Reformatio Legum," the conclusion must be drawn, that the reformed code had incorporated a large portion of the substance, and had imbibed a larger portion of the spirit, of the pontifical law. Another conclusion must not be suppressed, that the Reformers did not entertain those latitudinarian notions of a Christian Church which they have been commonly supposed to entertain. Erasmus, a German divine, had about this time promulgated the doctrine, that Christ and His Apostles had prescribed no particular form of Church government, and that the Christian Ministry was not of divine institution. He maintained, that the authority of a Christian minister was derived solely from the civil magistrate—that the ministerial office was merely suasory, and that coercion was not within its province; in fact, Erasmus formally renounced the power of the keys. Cranmer was at one time of his life suspected of inclining to these opinions, but he must have renounced them before this period. The authors of the "Reformatio Legum" were not Erastians.

## CHAPTER XI.

Influence of Northumberland, and Settlement of the Crown by Edward on Lady Jane Grey.—Conduct of Cranmer.—Death of Edward.—Succession of Mary, and unsuccessful effort of Northumberland to place Lady Jane Grey on the Throne.—His Trial and Execution.—The deprived Bishops restored.—Gardiner made Lord Chancellor.—Cranmer and other Protestant Bishops sent to the Tower.—Coronation of Mary.—Parliament assembles, and confirms the Queen's Legitimacy.—Statutes of Edward VI. concerning Religion repealed.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Reginald Pole appointed Legate by Paul III.—Wyatt's Rebellion, and Execution of Jane Grey.—Marriage of Mary with Philip, son of the Emperor Charles V.

If the “Reformatio Legum” had received the royal confirmation, the ecclesiastical polity would have harmonized in all its parts. It had undergone a complete change in its Liturgy, in its Creed, in its Catechism, and in every thing but its legal code; and as the system was reformed, its ministers had assumed a different character. The celibacy of the Clergy was no longer enjoined, for two Statutes had passed, after a strong resistance, allowing the marriage of Priests, the one by connivance<sup>a</sup>, and the other by direct permission<sup>b</sup>. The Clergy were now associated with the rest of the community; they had a reciprocity of interests, and the same ties; they no longer composed one great family relegated from the ordinary duties, and separated from the charities, of life.

Viewing the reformation of Edward as a whole, whatever justice there might be in the complaint that it had proceeded too far, the censure was unreasonable that it had not proceeded far enough, and that it was only the commencement of reform. The concession of a candid foreigner is conclusive: Bullinger freely allowed, that the reformation of Edward had satisfied the pious. If so,

<sup>a</sup> Stat. 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 22.

<sup>b</sup> 6 Edw. VI. c. 12.

enough had been done; for what reformation would have satisfied the fanatical, the licentious, and the profane?

From the time when the Duke of Somerset had declined in the favour of Edward, the Earl of Warwick had gradually advanced in power and influence, until he was able to destroy his former rival. Among his other honours he had been created Duke of Northumberland, the Earldom having lately become extinct. In Parliament his authority was almost despotic; he had a large majority in the House of Lords, and, by calling a new Parliament, he expected to gain an ascendant in the House of Commons.

As a proof of his influence and his ambition, he procured an Act for the suppression of the Bishopric of Durham<sup>c</sup>. Tonstal had been deprived of his see, and committed to the Tower on an unproved charge of misprision of treason, and the spiritual jurisdiction of the Bishopric was to be divided, while its temporalities were to be alienated. It was to be secularized; to be converted into a county palatine, and granted to the Duke of Northumberland.

To his aspiring views there were no bounds; and although it was impossible to gain the crown of England for himself, yet he endeavoured to settle it on his family, by a contrivance as devoid of refinement as of justice.

By a Statute passed in the reign of the late King, it was enacted, that, in default of issue by Prince Edward, the next heir, or in case of Edward's death, in default of issue from the King's marriage with Catherine Howard, the crown should devolve on the Lady Mary, his eldest daughter. In case of failure of issue from the Lady Mary; or in case of her failure in observing such limitations or conditions as the King might declare by his letters patent; his second daughter, Elizabeth, and her heirs were named in the succession. In the event that both his daughters died without issue; or in case they neglected to fulfil the conditions prescribed by the King; the King was em-

<sup>c</sup> Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. vii. p. 419.

powered to appoint an heir, either by his letters patent, or by his will, signed with his own hand.

By his last testament, Henry excluded the rightful line, that of Scotland, from the succession, and preferred the two daughters of the French Queen by Charles Brandon. Of these daughters, the Duchess of Suffolk was one; and to the eldest daughter of the Duchess, Lady Jane Grey, Northumberland had married his fourth son, Lord Guildford Dudley. The Duchess of Suffolk was ready to relinquish her title in favour of this daughter, and in prejudice of any male issue which she might afterwards bear.

To establish even the semblance of an hereditary title in favour of Lady Jane Grey was impossible. It was not strengthened by the assumption that the two daughters of Henry were illegitimate, for the issue of Charles Brandon was in a similar predicament: he was married to the French Queen while his former wife was living, and his marriage with her was never dissolved. If the legitimacy of the Duchess of Suffolk could be established, and if her hereditary claim was enforced by the testamentary disposition of Henry, she might herself have succeeded to the throne, but could not dispose of the crown to a daughter.

Mary, who stood next in succession by the will of Henry, had been always treated by her father with respect, though she had never possessed a large share in his affection. While her mother lived, from duty as well as from interest, she expressed a natural resentment at a divorce which stamped illegitimacy on herself, and brought disgrace on her family. But when Catherine was no more, and when the rival who had supplanted her was also removed, Mary availed herself of the favourable crisis, and made a forcible appeal to the sympathy of her father and her sovereign. A general submission was readily offered, but not accepted; and, after some hesitation and delay, she was induced to make a submission of her judgment on three distinct

articles : first, to acknowledge the King to be Supreme Head of the Church of England, and to submit to the laws of the kingdom ; secondly, to renounce the power and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome ; and, lastly, to acknowledge that the marriage between the King and her mother was incestuous and unlawful<sup>d</sup>.

These concessions were the foundation of a reconciliation ; and as her expectations of succeeding to the crown were entirely defeated by the birth of Edward, she lived in the contented performance of religious exercises, and in the unmolested enjoyment of her religious creed. Her doctrinal creed was that of Henry, and if her renunciation of the Papal supremacy were extorted, she had the prudence to conceal its insincerity.

On the accession of Edward, doctrinal Romanism, as well as the Papal supremacy, was proscribed. The young King was persuaded by others, or had persuaded himself, that even a toleration of the religion of the Romish Church was a toleration of idolatry, and that a toleration of idolatry was not less sinful in a Christian than in a Jewish King. Mary, however obsequious to her father, whom she dreaded, if she did not love, was not inclined to show the same deference to a brother in a state of nonage. She persisted in celebrating the Romish ritual in her family, and permitted more than her household to be present at the Mass. This being considered an excess of liberty, her two Chaplains were imprisoned, and though she laid a formal complaint of this rigorous treatment before the Council, no redress was given. The King, in a personal conference, refused to grant any longer indulgence of her idolatrous worship ; and the earnest solicitations of his Council, joined with the remonstrances of Cranmer and Ridley, could not prevail on him to relax the severity of the law, or to allow a temporary connivance at its violation.

Mary was not less bigoted to her own opinions, and with

<sup>d</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. ii. p. 332.

equal force pleaded the rights of conscience: she fearlessly told the King, that ‘ her soul was God’s,’ and ‘ that she would neither change her faith nor dissemble in her practice.’ She applied to the Emperor, and, through his interference, a compromise was agreed on; but it was soon broken. When the first Service Book was established by Act of Parliament, an attempt was made to bring the Princess to conformity. The Council reminded her, that every Article of the Creed was common to both Communions, and that the only difference between them was in the ceremonies and the use of the Sacraments. In these particulars the English Reformation had brought back divine worship to the rules of Scripture and the usage of the primitive Church. The cause of dispute lay within a narrow compass; the Princess Mary pleaded for later custom against truth, and the English Church for truth against custom<sup>e</sup>.

In this state of alienation between Edward and his sister Mary, Northumberland had little difficulty in persuading the young Prince to exclude her, if possible, from the succession; but it is surprising that he could have been induced to pass over his sister Elizabeth. Nothing but the domineering influence of Northumberland over the tender and declining mind of the King could have induced his consent to such a flagrant act of impolicy and injustice.

The price of the victim which this ambitious noble immolated at the shrine of his inordinate ambition enhanced the value of the sacrifice, and heightened its malignity. Among the examples of female excellence which history has recorded, there is none on which the mind dwells with greater pleasure than Jane Grey. Endowed with every personal grace, her understanding was more than feminine, and her literary acquirements were far beyond the age in which she lived. Her studies,

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. part ii. b. iv. p. 420.

under the tuition of Aylmer, comprehended both the Latin and Greek tongues, and in both these languages she is said to have excelled the King himself. Being of the same age with Edward, he regarded her not only with esteem, but with admiration; and if Providence had spared this excellent Prince, a consort worthy of him might have been found in Jane Grey<sup>f</sup>.

But the project of settling the Crown in such an unjust and illegal manner, even on so gifted an object, was received with astonishment and disgust. Edward first imparted his design to Sir Edward Montagu, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and the law officers of the Crown; but they objected, that the Act of Succession, having been ratified by Parliament, could not be annulled by a testament. They were required to reconsider the judgment which they had delivered; but mature deliberation only convinced them of its soundness. On their next appearance before the Council, they averred, that the assent of any Privy Counsellor to such a measure would involve him in the crime of high treason<sup>g</sup>. The King, with an asperity unusual to him, commanded them, on their allegiance, to draw up a form of settlement, with a promise, that it should be ratified by a future Parliament, and with a pardon to the Judges under the Great Seal, for their transgression of the Statute.

The Judges having been prevailed on to draw an entail of the Crown in a legal form, and having, with the exception of Sir James Hales, subscribed it, the instrument was brought to the Lord Chancellor for confirmation, under the Great Seal; but it was still necessary that the deed of settlement should receive the assent of the Privy Council.

<sup>f</sup> A Swiss Reformer, 'Johannes ab Ulmis,' mentions the report of this marriage in a letter published at Zurich, 1840. Massingberd's Eng. Ref. p. 406.

<sup>g</sup> Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. viii. p. 139.

Awed by the haughty demeanour of Northumberland, or swayed by the hopes of his future favour, most of the counsellors, without scruple, testified their approbation by signing the instrument; but Cecil and Cranmer boldly opposed an act of such illegality and injustice. The latter solicited a private interview with his Sovereign; but having experienced a refusal, the Archbishop gave his opinion openly to the King, in the presence of the Marquis of Northampton, and the Lord Chamberlain Darcy. He said that he would never consent to disinherit the daughters of his old master and early benefactor; that he had voluntarily sworn to the observance of the late King's will; and that, by subscribing the instrument before the Council, he must incur the guilt of perjury. In the conclusion, both Cecil and Cranmer were urged with an importunity almost amounting to compulsion, and affixed their names, the first, according to his own relation, merely as a witness, the last with a reluctance which even his enemies were constrained to admit as a sufficient justification <sup>h</sup>.

It was not without a presentiment of his approaching end that Edward executed this settlement; and, whatever may be thought of his judgment, no imputation can be laid against the purity of his intention. The last act of his life was suitable to the piety and benevolence by which it had been adorned. In the time of his sickness, Ridley, in a sermon, had expatiated on the duty of charity, and the particular obligation to its discharge in those of exalted

<sup>h</sup> Besides the deed of settlement, which was signed by thirty-three of the Privy Council, another instrument of adherence to the settlement was signed by twenty-four. In this instrument the names of Cecil and Cranmer both appear. Collier's Eccl. Hist. part ii. b. iv. p. 500. See also Strype's Mem. of Cranmer. Also Jenkyns' Cranmer, vol. i. p. 366. It is to be remembered, that the title of Lady Jane, if it had been ratified by Parliament, would have been the same as that of the House of Brunswick; popish succession being excluded. Massingberd, p. 408.

station. The King, after hearing the discourse, sent for the Bishop, whom he commanded to be seated in his presence covered, and desired that, as the preacher had given so general and public an exhortation, the confessor would give particular and confidential directions for its performance. The Bishop, astonished at this tenderness of conscience in so young a Prince, burst into tears expressive of joy, and, having recollected himself, craved permission for time to reflect, and consult with the magistrates of the city. The result of their deliberations was, that the poor should be divided into three classes: such as were poor through natural infirmity, such as had been reduced to poverty by accident, and such as were reduced to want through idleness. This representation having been submitted to the King, he assigned the church and revenues of the Grey Friars, near Newgate, as an asylum for orphans; the hospital of Saint Bartholomew, near Smithfield, as a retreat for the sick; and the palace of Bridewell as a place of correction for the idle. When he had finally established these three foundations, he returned thanks to God that his life had been prolonged for the completion of such a design.

Northumberland having procured a settlement of the Crown on his daughter-in-law, had little concern for the restoration of the King's health. So obnoxious was his character, that he was accused of accelerating the death of Edward, by calling in improper medical aid, and persuading the discharge of the regular physicians. One fact is well attested, that he attempted to secure the persons both of Mary and Elizabeth, by sending to each of the sisters intelligence of the King's sickness, and in his name requiring their attendance and society; but before either of them could obey the summons, death approached. The last moments of Edward were July 6. devoted to religious meditation, occasionally expressed in

short prayers and ejaculations. The concluding sentences which he was heard to utter were these: “Lord God, deliver me out of this miserable and wretched life, and take me among Thy chosen; howbeit, not my will but Thine be done! Lord, I commit my spirit unto Thee! O Lord, Thou knowest how happy it were to be with Thee; yet, for Thy chosen’s sake, send me life and health, that I may truly serve Thee! O Lord my God, bless my people, and save Thine inheritance! O Lord God, save Thy chosen people of England! O Lord God, defend this realm from papistry, and maintain Thy true religion, that I and my people may praise Thy holy Name, for Jesus Christ’s sake.”

The unprincipled and abortive attempt of Northumberland to place Jane Grey on the Throne will occupy but a small space in the history of the English Church. Mary had commenced her journey to London on the pretended summons of her brother; but, on receiving the intelligence of his death, she withdrew herself to a safe distance from the metropolis. Thence she addressed a letter to the Lords of the Council, expressing her regret at the King’s death, and asserting her title to the Crown. She did not pretend ignorance of the preparations made to overturn the Constitution, and defeat her right; but she was willing to pardon what had already been done, if her subjects returned to their duty and allegiance.

The Lords of the Council returned an immediate answer, reminding her that the marriage of her mother had been pronounced invalid by the Ecclesiastical Courts according to the laws of God and the country, and the sentence of divorce had been confirmed by successive Parliaments. She had been declared by the Statutes of the realm illegitimate, and consequently was incapable of succession to the Throne. Therefore they required her to renounce her pretensions, and not to disturb the established govern-

ment; and they promised that, by her submission, she would induce them to render any service to her which might be consistent with their duty.

The strongest argument in favour of the succession of Jane was her confessed predilection for the Protestant faith, as the most popular reason for the exclusion of Mary was her inflexible attachment to the religion of her mother. Ridley was appointed by the Council to set forth to the people, in a sermon at Saint Paul's Cross, both the title of Queen Jane, and also the dangers which must accrue to their religion, if the daughter of Catherine of Arragon should ascend the Throne of England. To disprove the title of Mary was a task beyond the abilities even of Ridley; but he expatiated strongly on her character, and related an instance of his personal experience of her bigotry. His discourse failed to impress his auditors with conviction: they knew that, unless they betrayed their religion, no earthly power could take it from them, and that the plea of religion could not sanction an act of injustice<sup>i</sup>.

As soon as Northumberland had left the capital to place himself at the head of the army, the Council resolved to retrace their first hasty step, and to declare in favour of Mary. Uniting with the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London, they proclaimed her in the city, and then returned to the cathedral of Saint Paul, where they all solemnly returned thanks to God. An order was immediately sent to the Duke of Suffolk to deliver up the Tower, and to his daughter to relinquish her title of Queen. The Duke of Northumberland, at the head of a small body of troops, had reached Cambridge, where he was Chancellor of the University and High Steward of the town; but having been advertised of the change of events, he spontaneously proclaimed Mary Queen of England in the market-place, with every outward demonstration of joy.

<sup>i</sup> Collier's Eccl. Hist. part ii. b. v. p. 5.

On her approach to London, Mary was joined by a numerous train, and by her sister Elizabeth. They were then united by interest, if not by affection; for both were involved in the same imputation of illegitimacy. The new Queen entered her capital with great solemnity and pomp, and the first act of her authority was calculated to secure the interest of the Romish party. When she came to the Tower, the Duke of Norfolk, who had been imprisoned there before the death of her father; Gardiner, the late Bishop of Winchester, who had been deprived of his liberty, with a short intermission, during the whole reign of her brother; the Duchess of Somerset, who had been confined two years; and the Lord Courtney, son of the Marquess of Exeter, who had been in custody since his father's attainder; having presented themselves, and kneeled before her on the parade, they were immediately released, the Queen graciously claiming them as her own captives<sup>k</sup>.

A few days after her accession, the Queen made a declaration in council, that, although her own conscience was fixed in matters of religion, yet she was resolved not to compel or constrain others, otherwise than God should impress on their hearts a persuasion of that truth which she had embraced, and to which she still adhered. Yet she was not willing to leave her people to their recollections, for she signified her intention of assisting their religious inquiries by the ministry of godly, virtuous, and learned preachers, whose instructions she trusted, by the Divine assistance, would be effectual.

Mary was inclined immediately to effect a personal reconciliation with the See of Rome, thinking that her illegitimacy would be removed most effectually by papal authority. But to this premature step, solid objections were opposed by Gardiner, and they were not less solid, because dictated by interest. He intended to make the

<sup>k</sup> Stowe's Annals, p. 613. Lond. 1631.

reconciliation of Mary with the Apostolic See, if not a step on which to raise himself, yet at least a fence for his own security. To all the measures for the subversion of the papal authority in the reign of Henry he had cheerfully agreed, and in the divorce of Catherine he had been conspicuously distinguished. His treatise on true obedience was still in existence, and was a permanent record of his sentiments. He therefore persuaded the Queen not to endanger the possession of a throne, on which she was scarcely secure, and to have recourse to parliamentary rather than to papal authority for the establishment of her legitimacy. The Queen testified her approbation of this advice, by conferring on its author the dignity of Lord Chancellor, and by resigning to him the chief management of political affairs.

The abject submission of Northumberland, when resistance was unavailing, was treated as it deserved; and he was tried at Westminster-hall before his Peers. Having rested his defence on two points of law, both of which were overruled by his judges, he confessed his guilt, and resigned himself to the clemency of the Queen. Whether he had dissembled his religious sentiments throughout the last reign, or whether he changed them at this crisis, in the expectation of preserving his life, is uncertain; but on the scaffold he unequivocally professed his sincere belief in the Roman Catholic faith. He exhorted the people to be firm in the religion of their forefathers, and to reject the “new teaching.” Innovations in religion had caused all the miseries of the last thirty years, and therefore he conjured the people, if they would avoid a recurrence of such calamities, to drive out of the nation those trumpets of sedition, the new preachers. As to himself, whatever he might have pretended, he believed no other creed than that which his ancestors believed, of which the Roman Catholic faith was an article. Being blinded by ambition, he had made wreck of his conscience,

and for his sacrifice of principle to worldly interest he expressed a deep contrition.

The five Bishops, who had been deprived in the last reign, were soon restored to their sees. Boner was reinstated in the see of London, by virtue of a royal commission, purporting that he had preferred a petition for a review of the sentence of deprivation pronounced against him by the delegates, and that, the sentence being found illegal, it was thereby revoked. Tonstal had been dispossessed of the Bishopric of Durham purely on secular grounds ; for though he was a Romanist in doctrine, yet he had submitted to the laws of Edward. The Duke of Northumberland had seized the regalities of the see<sup>1</sup>; but, in consequence of the attainder of that nobleman, they reverted to the Queen, and she applied them to the restoration of the Bishopric in all its former splendour. In the letters patent, directed to Tonstal, it was recited, that some wicked men had procured the dissolution of the Bishopric to gratify their love of gain and aggrandizement. It is scarcely necessary to add, that, together with Heath and Day, who were restored to their sees of Worcester and Chichester, Gardiner, at the same time that he was invested with the Chancellorship, was replaced in the Bishopric of Winchester.

On this Prelate now devolved the chief authority in the Church, as well as the State ; and his first interference in ecclesiastical matters was in his capacity of Lord Chancellor. The Queen having declared that her only method of bringing back her people to the truth was by exhortation and preaching, a commission was granted to the Lord Chancellor, authorizing him to license, under the Great Seal, such grave, learned, and discreet persons, as he should think meet and able to preach the word of God. All who were thus licensed were qualified to preach in any cathedral or parochial church to which he might think it

<sup>1</sup> See Spelman's Hist. and Fate of Sacrilege, App. 2. ed. 1846.

convenient to send them. Thus the Reformers were not only deprived of all hope of procuring licences for themselves, but were compelled to admit preachers selected by Gardiner into their own churches. Many of them, however, continued to preach openly, notwithstanding the Queen's injunction, while others were contented with performing divine offices according to the Liturgy of King Edward, and to communicate their pastoral addresses in private houses.

Cranmer, during these great changes, had not been an inattentive spectator. Almost immediately after the accession of the Queen, he was summoned before the Privy Council, to account for his signature to the Will of the late King: but he was so clear in this respect of any treasonable intentions, and his unwillingness to affix his name to the Deed of Settlement was so notorious, that he was dismissed with a reprimand, and with an injunction not to leave his house. Thus time was afforded for deliberation on his future course.

Some of his most attached friends, convinced of his impending fate, urged him to fly while he was yet at liberty. In Germany he was remembered with esteem and affection, and there might be certain of finding an honourable asylum. His answer was worthy of his character and station, and he expressed his resolution not to desert his post now that it was a post of danger. But while he was regardless of his own safety, he was not unmindful of the safety of his advisers, and he exhorted them to fly, with a warmth of persuasion as strong as his own determination to remain was unmoveable.

Peter Martyr was compelled to leave Oxford, and to seek protection at Lambeth; and while this distinguished foreigner still remained under the insecure protection of his early patron, Cranmer, by the advice of his guest, resolved to give a decisive proof of his steady adherence to the Protestant faith. Such was the natural mildness

of his temper, that his enemies, mistaking it for pusillanimity or tergiversation<sup>m</sup>, had spread a report of his intention to officiate before the Queen in the Latin Service, and to celebrate the Mass. To exculpate himself from so false a charge, he drew up a manifesto; but which, from the vehemence and intemperance of its style, was more probably the composition of Peter Martyr than of himself. Its substance was, that as Satan, himself a liar, and the father of lies, had at no time abstained from arming his slaves and hirelings against Christ and His religion, he was at that time more than ordinarily busy. For whereas King Henry the Eighth had begun the correction of the abuses of the Latin Mass, which his son Edward had entirely removed; and whereas the Lord's Supper was restored to its first institution, and the model of the primitive Church, yet the devil had attempted to bring the Mass again into its room, as being his own invention. That this stratagem might be effected more easily, certain persons had dared to abuse the name and authority of himself as Archbishop, giving out that the Mass had been restored at Canterbury by his order, and also that he had offered to sing Mass before the Queen at the funeral of King Edward, at St. Paul's and other places. Though for the space of twenty years past he had borne with fortitude and patience the empty and false reports which were spread concerning him, yet he thought it injurious to God and his truth at that time to be silent under such unfounded imputations. Therefore he protested to all the world that the Mass was not set up at Canterbury by his order, but by a fawning, false, and hypocritical monk, (Thornton, suffragan of Dover,) without his counsel or

<sup>m</sup> "This day is looked that Mr. Canterbury must be placed where is meet for him: he is become very humble, and ready to submit himself in all things; but that will not serve." Boner's Letter, dated Sept. 6, 1553. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. ii. no. 7.

consciousness. As for his having undertaken to celebrate Mass before the Queen, or in any other place, the Queen herself knew well the falsehood of the report. But in order to give an incontrovertible proof of his sincerity, he offered to maintain in a public disputation, the English Communion Service, both from the authority of the Scriptures and the practice of the primitive Church, and to prove that the Mass was contrary to both. Although Peter Martyr had been called by some malevolent persons an unlearned man, yet, if a royal licence could be obtained, he would, in conjunction with Peter Martyr, and five or six other associates, selected by himself, defend, not only the Book of Common Prayer and the other Rites and Ceremonies prescribed by it, but the whole doctrine and form of religion as it had been established by the late King<sup>n</sup>.

This manifesto had been prepared by Cranmer with an intention of making a public use of it, but the time of its publication was anticipated. Having shewn it to Scory, the late Bishop of Chichester, that Prelate indiscreetly circulated it, and a copy was publicly read in the city of London. This unjustifiable step on the part of Scory occasioned a summons of the Archbishop before the Council, when two interrogatories were demanded of him: first, whether he were the author of the seditious paper which had been published in his name? secondly, whether, if the paper were indeed his, he was sorry for its publication? To these questions Cranmer replied, that he was indeed the author of the paper falsely called seditious; and that he was not ashamed of its substance, which he was prepared to defend: but that he was sorry for its premature disclosure. He had intended to enlarge on many points in it, and then to affix it, attested by his own hand and seal, to the doors of the cathedral of Saint Paul, and other churches in the metropolis.

Contrary to general expectation, the Archbishop was

<sup>n</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. ii. no. 8.

dismissed on that day, but within a few days afterwards was committed to the Tower, on a charge of high treason, and of dispersing seditious writings. But Cranmer was not the only object of royal displeasure, even at this early period, and of persecution merely on account of religion. Ridley, in consequence of his sermon at Saint Paul's Cross, could not reasonably expect to escape punishment; but Hooper, who had espoused the cause of Mary with a warmth almost incompatible with his strong abhorrence of popery, was rewarded for his loyalty with imprisonment, because he had disobeyed the injunctions of the Lord Chancellor concerning preachers. Latimer, who had refused to resume the episcopal office under Edward, which he had resigned in the reign of Henry, but who was one of the most popular preachers of the reformed doctrines, was summoned before the Council to render an account of his preaching, and in consequence of his “seditious demeanour” was also committed to the Tower.

Shortly after her accession, Mary had summoned a Parliament, and the ceremony of her coronation was performed a few days before its meeting. Gardiner placed the crown on her head, with all the pompous ceremonial of the Romish Church; and Day, lately restored to the Bishopric of Chichester, the most eloquent preacher of the Romish party, delivered the coronation sermon.

That no opportunity might be neglected of preparing the people for the re-establishment of the Romish faith, the day of the coronation was selected for a display of the royal bounty. An act of grace, or a general amnesty, had been the customary accompaniment of this solemn pageant, but now an extraordinary largess was distributed. Notwithstanding the exhausted state of the treasury, and the accumulation of the public debts, the Queen discharged her subjects from the subsidies granted by the preceding Parliament, and which had now become due. The only recompense which she expected for this act of liberality

was, that her loving subjects would “bind themselves wholly to God, to serve Him sincerely, and with continual prayer, for the honour and advancement of the Queen and Commonwealth.”

In the writ by which the Parliament was assembled, the Queen still retained her title of ‘Supreme Head of the Church.’ The writ by virtue of which the Convocation was to meet had been, according to custom, directed to the Archbishop of Canterbury; but, in consequence of the imprisonment of Cranmer, it was executed by Boner, as Bishop of London and provincial Dean. All the Protestant Prelates, with the exception of two, were either imprisoned or had fled; for the Archbishop of York had been sent to the Tower, on a general charge of heinous offences. Thus no serious opposition to the measures of the Queen, or her chief minister, could be expected, either in Parliament or in Convocation.

After the preliminary forms at the meeting of a new Parliament had been transacted, there was a prorogation of two days; and in what must be called its second Session, the legitimacy of the Queen was confirmed, and the sentence of divorce between Henry the Eighth and Catherine of Spain declared void.<sup>o</sup> “Truth,” in the language of the Statute, “however obscured and borne down, will at length break out.” The marriage was affirmed to have been originally lawful; but some malicious persons had endeavoured to infuse conscientious scruples into the King’s mind, and by sinister practices, and secret threats, had procured the seals of several Universities, abroad and at home, to instruments in condemnation of a marriage which was legal. The sentence of divorce was pronounced by “Thomas Cranmer, then newly made Archbishop of Canterbury,” upon these surreptitious and pretended testimonies, “upon his own unadvised understanding of the Scriptures, and some base

<sup>o</sup> Stat. 1 Mary, 2d sess. c. 1.

and most untrue conjectures." The divorce thus unlawfully procured was confirmed by two Acts of Parliament, in which the illegitimacy of the present Queen was contained. The present Statute, therefore, repealed these two Acts<sup>p</sup>, and declared that the sentence of divorce was from the beginning null and void.

By procuring the enactment of this Statute, Gardiner fulfilled his promise to the Queen of establishing her legitimacy by parliamentary and not by papal authority; but if he were the actual framer of the Statute, he shewed that "he was past all shame."<sup>q</sup> The divorce had been prosecuted by Gardiner in the consistory of Rome, before Cranmer was known to King Henry; and in all the proceedings in England, he was Henry's confidential adviser and advocate. To him was intrusted the arrangement and selection of the evidence; and when a resolution was adopted of passing the sentence of divorce by the mere authority of the English Metropolitan, if Cranmer presided, Gardiner actively forwarded the business of the court. If Gardiner had not conducted the affair to that position in which Cranmer found it, the sentence of divorce could not have been pronounced.

The title of the Queen being thus confirmed, the next Act of the Parliament was to repeal all the laws concerning religion passed in the late reign<sup>r</sup>. The preamble of the Statute set forth the great disorders which had happened by religious innovations, and by departing from that faith which had been transmitted from former ages. On this account, all the laws which had been made in the reign of King Edward concerning religion were repealed, and no other form of Service was to be used than that which had been used in the last year of Henry the Eighth. Not less than nine Statutes were thus repealed, of which

<sup>p</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 22. and 28 Hen. VIII. c. 7.

<sup>q</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 509.

<sup>r</sup> Stat. 1 Mary, sess. 2. c. 2.

the principal were, for giving the Communion in both kinds; for establishing the first and second Service Book; for confirming the new Ordinal; for allowing the marriage of Priests, and making their issue legitimate; and for the appointment of Bishops by the King's letters patent. That the Romish religion might be reinstated, and celebrated without disturbance or impediment, it was enacted in a separate Statute, that whoever should maliciously molest any preacher, duly licensed to preach, during his sermon, or should maliciously disturb any lawful priest preparing or celebrating the Mass, or should maliciously injure any crucifix or cross, were to suffer imprisonment for three months, or until they expressed penitence for their offences<sup>s</sup>.

Towards the close of the Session, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Guildford Dudley, and Lady Jane Grey, with two other sons of the late Duke of Northumberland, were brought to their trial. Cranmer, on submitting himself to the royal clemency, pointed out in a forcible manner the unwillingness with which he had agreed to exclude the Queen from the succession, and that he had refused his consent until the judges, and other lawyers, had led the way. His arguments could not arrest the sentence of the law: he was attainted for levying war against the Queen, and for conspiring to set up another in her room; but though sentence was passed, execution was stayed. Together with the rest of the prisoners, he was remanded to the Tower, for the fate of all was to be decided by future contingencies.

Having thus related the proceedings in Parliament, the attention is naturally directed to those which took place in Convocation. Boner, as Bishop of London, was pre-

<sup>s</sup> Another Act of a private nature occasioned a long debate, that for repealing the Act which allowed the second marriage of the Marquis of Northampton. The Act was passed in opposition to the principles of the Canon Law, which it was the object of this reign to restore.

sident, and Weston, Dean of Westminster, was chosen prolocutor of the Lower House. The sermon was preached by Harpsfield, in which he inveighed against the conduct of the Clergy during the late reign; that they had made a breach in the unity of the Church, poisoned the kingdom with heterodoxy, and misled many souls to perdition.

The only Protestant Prelates who had ventured to appear in the House of Lords were Taylor, Bishop of Lincoln, and Harley, Bishop of Hereford; but they soon withdrew, or were compelled to retire<sup>t</sup>. Neither of these Prelates ventured to take his place in Convocation, and the few who assembled in the Upper House were decided Romanists. In the Lower House a precaution was taken to secure the return of such proctors as were friendly to the views of the Court; but a part of the assembly was not elective, and there were five non-compliers, whom, being Deans or Archdeacons, it was impossible to exclude.

Weston, the prolocutor, to whom belonged the office of preparing and arranging the business of the House, stated, that it was the Queen's pleasure to have certain controversial points debated, and that the result of their debates should be framed into canons to be ratified by the royal assent. Thence he passed on to a formal condemnation of the late Catechism and Liturgy, denouncing both as heretical, particularly in those Articles which related to the Sacrament of the Altar. He intimated to the House, that, after a prorogation of two days, a discussion would take place on two questions: first, whether, in the Sacrament, the bread and wine were not changed, after consecration, into the body and blood of Christ; secondly, whether the natural body of Christ was not corporally present in the Eucharist, either by the transubstantiation of the elements, or, as some expressed it, by the conjunction of concomitance.

<sup>t</sup> According to Foxe, Taylor was violently thrust out of the House for refusing to give reverence to the Mass. *Acts and Mon.* vol. iii. p. 15.

The members, expecting a disputation, prepared for the contest; but, at the next meeting, the prolocutor exhibited two propositions for the subscription of the House, one being an affirmation of the natural presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar, the other a censure of the late Catechism. Both those Articles were subscribed by all the members, except five; but Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, having offered something in defence of the Catechism, contended that it was contrary to reason and precedent to require a subscription to Articles before they had been discussed. As the number of those who maintained the affirmative of the propositions far exceeded the dissentients in that House, he moved that Ridley, and other distinguished Protestant Prelates, might be allowed to bear a part in the disputation. The request being proposed to the Bishops, it was of course denied, for Ridley was a prisoner; but the prolocutor consented to fix a day for a public disputation, which was attended by a vast concourse of the nobility and commonalty.

Seldom have public disputations tended to elicit truth, or to produce conviction: they have tended rather to increase difference of opinion into personal animosity; and the present case is no exception to the truth. The whole proceeding was conducted with notorious partiality by the prolocutor, and it was terminated without any satisfactory result. It continued during three days, greatly to the disadvantage of the Romanists, and the mortification of Weston; but on the third day he resolved to end the debate. Some Protestant disputant having said in the heat of argument, "We have the word," meaning that they had Scripture in their favour, the prolocutor insultingly answered, "But we have the sword<sup>a</sup>." Philpot was commanded no more to appear in the House, unless

<sup>a</sup> See Bishop Warburton's Remarks on Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 3. Warb. Works, vol. vii. p. 891.

on condition of preserving silence, or of speaking with the permission of the prolocutor.

Although the Parliament had restored the national religion to its state at the death of Henry, and although the Convocation, by strength of numbers, if not of argument, had re-established the doctrine of the corporal presence, yet Mary was far removed from the object of her warmest wishes, the recognition of the papal authority in England. Gardiner had triumphantly carried her so far; but here, it is most probable, he would have rested. Even if a reconciliation with Rome could have been effected without caution, it may well be doubted whether he would have consented, if he had been left to his own inclinations. He now held the reins of government. He possessed the highest office in the State; and he entertained a sanguine hope of succeeding to the highest dignity in the Church. A reconciliation with Rome would probably diminish his temporal power, and would indubitably disappoint his attainment of the highest ecclesiastical dignity in England. The see of Canterbury, he well knew, was designed by his royal mistress for another more favoured claimant; for one to whom she was bound by every tie of gratitude and honour; whom a long absence had not effaced from her affectionate remembrance; who had consoled her in the hour of trial, and whose participation in her prosperity would enhance its enjoyment,

Reginald Pole, both by paternal and maternal descent, was allied to the royal blood of England\*, and his virtues reflected lustre on his noble birth. He had assumed the profession of an ecclesiastic at the desire of Henry the Eighth; and that monarch had anxiously superintended his education, with a view of elevating him to the English Primacy. The Deanery of Exeter, and some inferior preferments, had been conferred on him at an early period

\* Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. i. b. iii. p. 442.

of life, for the purpose of affording a suitable maintenance at a foreign University. When the agents of Henry were employed in collecting the determinations of academical bodies, concerning the legality of his marriage with Catherine, Pole was at Paris, and he firmly, though not offensively, refused to concur in any application to these authorities. Shortly afterwards he returned to his native country, and was in his place in the Convocation which tendered the submission of the Clergy, and acknowledged the King as Supreme Head of the Church. Either a disgust at the measures of Henry, or a desire of cultivating his studies, or the concurrence of both these motives, induced him again to leave England, and he selected the University of Padua as the place of his residence. Padua was famed not so much for the cultivation of the fine arts, as for classical literature, and the higher branches of science; and these pursuits were congenial to the taste of the English ecclesiastic. He devoted himself to the study of the best Roman authors, and to Latin composition. Bembo, Centareno, Caraffa, and Sadoletto, were proud to be enrolled among the number of his friends, and joined in celebrating the talents and acquirements of Reginald Pole.

Often had Henry invited the object of his almost paternal solicitude to return to England, to fulfil the duties of his station, and in due time to receive those higher rewards which he so well merited. The invitation was constantly declined, till, finding that excuses would be admitted no longer, he was compelled to inform his sovereign and benefactor, that his conscience revolted both from the divorce from Catherine, and also from the separation of England from the Apostolic See. Henry, having transmitted a treatise in vindication of his conduct, written by Samson, Dean of the Chapel Royal, Pole undertook to answer it, in his celebrated book on the Unity of the Church. The work abounded with personal

invective, and far exceeded the style of dispassionate and fair argument, and it was not without effect, though it answered not the end intended by Pole. Henry deprived him of all his preferments, and then consigned him to irrevocable expatriation, by procuring against him a bill of attainder.

If a secret affection for the Princess Mary were the real motive for his spirited opposition to Henry, though something must be detracted from his disinterestedness, yet his generosity and consistency will suffer no diminution. His latent attachment for the daughter of the ill-fated Catherine will account for and excuse the excitement and exasperation which his work displays, and his love for Mary can alone exculpate him from the charge of ingratitude to her father.

The loss of the patronage of Henry was abundantly recompensed by the imperial and papal Courts. Ecclesiastical preferments were liberally bestowed, and a place in the sacred College was conferred on him by Paul the Third. On the death of that Pontiff, his royal extraction, his literary attainments, and his urbanity <sup>1549</sup> of manners, were qualities not forgotten in the choice of a successor; and if the modesty of Pole had not impeded his own advancement, he might have been the second Englishman who sat in the papal chair<sup>y</sup>. Julius the Third, conscious that his own election was owing to the reluctance of Pole to accept the popedom, was warm in his deference and gratitude, and during his pontificate, the influence of the English Cardinal in the conclave was unrivalled.

Years had now rolled on, and Pole, in the placid enjoyment of ecclesiastical dignity and literary retirement, had forgotten the misfortunes of his early life, and remembered the injuries of Mary with sorrow and sensibility, rather than with bitterness. But when the object of his

<sup>y</sup> Adrian IV. was an Englishman: elected in 1154.

youthful devotedness was unexpectedly called to that high station for which she was educated, his joy was not less ardent, because unmixed with any feelings of personal attachment. Her cause, in his estimation, was connected with the cause of religion.

Immediately on her accession, Mary had communicated the intelligence to the Court of Rome, and signified her wish that Pole might be appointed the Pope's legate in England. At the time when the request was made, Pole was at a distance from the capital of Italy, and the appointment was made during his absence. As he was not slow in returning those congratulations which he sincerely felt, so he commenced his journey without delay. But an unexpected event detained him in the midst of his progress, an event for which England and Europe were unprepared.

Charles the Fifth had no sooner been informed of the death of Edward, and the succession of Mary, than he meditated the annexation of England to his other dominions. Apprehensive that his son Philip, who, though a widower, was still in early manhood, might decline a marriage with a Princess many years older, he determined, in case of Philip's refusal, to offer himself a second time to his cousin, to whom he had been once betrothed. Contrary to his calculations, the proposal was accepted without hesitation by Philip, who was willing, according to the maxim of Princes, to sacrifice his inclination to his ambition. The Emperor, as soon as Mary was seated on the throne, together with his congratulations, sent a proposal of marriage between the Queen of England and the heir of the imperial crown. Mary, dazzled with the prospect of marrying the son of the greatest monarch in Europe; glad to unite herself more closely with her mother's family, to which she had been always warmly attached; and eager to secure the powerful aid which she knew would be necessary towards her favourite scheme of re-establishing the

Romish religion in England, listened in the most favourable manner to the proposal<sup>z</sup>.

Among her subjects, however, the projected union was received with general discontent. Those who favoured the Reformation, saw in such a marriage the complete extinction of their hopes; those to whom religion was a matter of indifference, feared a revolution in the government. The Spanish character was regarded by the English with antipathy; and they justly dreaded, both from the character of Philip, and the despotic nature of the Spanish monarchy, that the liberties of England would be endangered.

But Mary, inflexible in all her resolutions, and disdainful of popular opinion, was impenetrable either to murmurs or remonstrances. The Emperor, by various arts, secured those ministers who were in her highest confidence, and large sums were remitted in order to gain the consent of the Council. Cardinal Pole was detained at Dillinghen, in Germany, by the Emperor's command, lest, by his presence in England, he might defeat the pretensions of Philip. His personal rivalry was not expected; but it was feared that he might employ his interest in favour of his relative, Courtney, Earl of Devonshire, whom the English ardently wished their Sovereign to select as her husband<sup>a</sup>.

Gardiner, who dreaded Pole as a present rival in political power, and a future superior in ecclesiastical rank, willingly seized any opportunity of retarding the journey of the legate, and a reconciliation with the See of Rome. On this account, he promoted the marriage with sincerity, and contended that it ought to precede a recognition of the papal jurisdiction. The House of Commons had presented an earnest and humble address, praying the Queen not to marry a stranger, and this circumstance was converted by

<sup>z</sup> Robertson's History of Charles V. b. xi. p. 223.

<sup>a</sup> Carte's Hist. Engl. vol. iii. b. xvii. p. 296.

Gardiner, not into a reason for rejecting the marriage, but for insisting on more advantageous terms.

The articles of the treaty were undoubtedly framed with great address, and if there had been a probability that they would have been enforced or observed, were highly beneficial to England. But the people adopted a different interpretation, and contended, that, in proportion as they were favourable to one party, they must be unjust to the other, and that the party injured would watch with anxious vigilance for an occasion of violating them. These sentiments prevailed so generally, that every part of the kingdom was filled with discontent at the marriage, and with indignation against its advisers. Sir Thomas Wyat, a gentleman of some note, of equivocal intentions, but of confessed incapacity, took advantage of the general disaffection. He succeeded in exciting the men of Kent to arms, in order to save their country from a foreign yoke. Though he said nothing publicly of the danger which threatened religion, yet he gave private assurances of his inclination to the reformed doctrines, assurances which were discovered to be false. Such numbers of malcontents resorted in a short time to his standard, his march to London was conducted with such rapidity, and the Queen was so entirely destitute of any means of defence, that if Wyat had possessed talents in any degree equal to the boldness of his enterprise, the rebellion must have proved fatal to the power, if not to the life, of Mary. In the moment when the rebels were flushed with success, a messenger was sent from the Queen to inquire the demands of the insurgents, and the terms on which they would be contented to disperse. But the extravagant propositions of Wyat, at the same time that they precluded all adjustment, were also a proof of his weakness or his malignancy. His measures were conceived with so little foresight, and executed with so great irresolution, that he was deserted by many of his followers, the re-

mainder was dispersed by a far inferior force, and himself was captured, and consigned to the punishment due to his rashness and rebellion.

The authority of Mary was confirmed and increased by this inconsiderate and mischievous attempt to destroy it; and her conduct, during the time of the greatest danger, was such as to raise her character in the public estimation. She displayed a magnanimity worthy of the house of Tudor. It was on Ash Wednesday when Wyat and his followers entered London; but the Queen rejected every solicitation to quit her palace and seek safety in the Tower. With her priests and attendants, she repaired to her devotions in her chapel with the greatest composure.

One consequence of Wyat's rebellion was the execution of Lady Jane Grey and her husband. She was not unprepared for the event, for she was aware that the lightest suspicion would furnish a pretext for taking her life. So deeply rooted in her was religious principle, that her piety has been represented as ostentatious, or bigoted, or hypocritical, by the Romanists; but the concluding scene of her life shows, to an unprejudiced mind, the strength of her belief, and the Christian humility of her temper. One Harding, who had been Chaplain to her father, and a zealous preacher of the reformed doctrines, had animated the people by his exhortations to prepare for persecution; but on the accession of Mary, when persecution approached, he had himself fallen away from the faith which he had so energetically taught. To reclaim this apostate was one of the last efforts of Jane Grey; but her expostulations, conveyed in a letter, however forcible, from the situation of the writer, were unavailing<sup>b</sup>. Equally unavailing were the endeavours of the Romish clergy to effect a change in her opinions. Fecknam, the Abbot of Westminster, was sent by the Queen to prepare her for death; and though she rejected his spiritual counsel, she wrought powerfully

<sup>b</sup> The letter has been preserved by Fox in his *Acts and Monuments*.

on his feelings. By his intercession a respite of three days was allowed, and his attendance on her was continued even to the scaffold.

The night before her execution, she sent the Greek Testament, which had been the companion of her prison hours, to her sister, and the letter which accompanied the gift expressed her high reverence for the word of God, and contained an earnest desire that her sister, after her example, would make it the subject of her study. On the fatal day, when she saw her husband led out to suffer, her feelings overcame her; but the pang was momentary, and she recovered her serenity. When conducted to the scaffold, she confessed herself guilty of the act for which she was condemned to suffer; but the crown was neither procured nor desired by her. Her melancholy fate, she trusted, would warn posterity not to yield to the ambitious views of others. Having repeated her declaration of dying in the faith of Christ, and of relying solely on His merits for acceptance, she recited with great devotion the fifty-first Psalm, and her dying ejaculation was, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!”

Though the innocence of Jane Grey, in the rebellion of Wyat, was clear, yet her father, the Duke of Suffolk, was deeply involved in it. He was tried by his Peers, and, having been found guilty, died with little pity or respect. Elizabeth herself could not escape suspicion; for it was surmised that Courtney, Earl of Devonshire, was implicated in the conspiracy, that he designed to marry her, and to seat her on the throne. In consequence of this suspicion, the Earl was rigorously confined, and Elizabeth, after suffering a long imprisonment in the Tower, was restored only to a limited enjoyment of her liberty.

These severities effectually suppressed all opposition to the projected alliance between Philip and Mary, and the express assent of the succeeding Parliament was secured by Gardiner. The articles of marriage, framed by his

advice, and under his superintendence, were ratified by a Statute<sup>c</sup>; they were not only confirmed as they were originally framed, but an explanation was added in respect of an important part. The entire government of the realm was vested in the Queen. The Spaniards, under a pretext of conciliating the English nation to the proposed marriage, had derived the pedigree of Philip from John of Gaunt, and represented the future husband of their Queen as an Englishman, rather than an alien. Such an extravagant pretension tended to excite suspicion, rather than to gain favour, and it infused additional vigilance into Gardiner. Whatever might have been his general character, whatever might have been his real motives on this occasion, he acted like a statesman and a patriot: he laboured to preserve the independence of England, and to prevent her from being reduced to a province of Spain.

## CHAPTER XII.

Royal Injunction for the re-establishment of the Romish Religion.—Protestant Bishops and Clergy deprived.—Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer sent to Oxford.—Disputation held there on the Corporal Presence.—Projected Disputation at Cambridge defeated.—Philip arrives in England.—Marriage with Mary solemnized.—Third Parliament of Mary.—Pole's Attainder reversed.—Reconciliation of England to the See of Rome.—Policy of Pole and Gardiner.—Statutes against Heresy revived.

ALTHOUGH the authority of the Pope was not yet restored, the ritual of the Romish Church was re-established by law, and the Queen was not tardy in executing the Statutes to which the last Parliament had assented. The Bishops received a royal injunction to institute an immediate visitation of their Clergy, and

<sup>c</sup> Stat. 1 Mary, Sess. 3. c. 2.

with the injunction a book of articles to direct their inquiries<sup>d</sup>.

The injunction expatiated on the disorders which had taken place in the last reign through neglect of discipline; and the Bishops were commanded to enforce the canons and ecclesiastical laws as they were left by Henry the Eighth. The sequel of the injunction gave an intimation, not to be mistaken, of her intention once more to submit the kingdom to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Romish See; for, in all the processes of the ecclesiastical courts, the Bishops were no longer to use the Queen's name. The injunction went farther, for it directed that the oath of supremacy should not be administered in future to the Clergy. The Bishops were admonished against admitting any person into holy Orders, who was suspected of heresy, and to exercise due vigilance for the detection and punishment of heretics. All married clergymen were to be removed and separated from their wives, and deprived of their benefices; but such as were willing to quit their wives might be promoted to other benefices, or might be entitled to a pension from the benefice of which they had been dispossessed. All processions of the Church were to be used in the Latin tongue, according to the old order, and all laudable ceremonies formerly in use were to be revived. Those who had been promoted to holy Orders, "after the new sort and fashion of Orders," since they were not canonically ordained, were to be re-admitted by the Bishop of the diocese, if he found them in other respects qualified. An uniform system of doctrine was to be set forth in Homilies for public use, and the people were to be compelled to attend on divine service. Schoolmasters and instructors of youth were to be examined with respect to their religious tenets, and if they were suspected of heresy, to be prohibited from teaching youth. In conclusion, the Bishops and Governors of the Church

<sup>d</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. ii. no. 10.

were exhorted to set an example of holy living, and to suppress vice and impiety.

The injunction was little more than a recapitulation of the late Statutes, and those articles which may properly be called penal were immediately put in force. A commission was directed to several Bishops, at the head of which was Gardiner, for depriving such of their brethren as had broken their vows, and defiled their functions, by marriage. Four of the offending Prelates, the Archbishop of York, with the Bishops of Saint David's, Chester, and Bristol, were deprived for this cause on the same day. Another commission was issued to the same persons, empowering them to cite Taylor, falsely calling himself Bishop of Lincoln; Hooper and Harley, the pretended Bishops of Gloucester and Hereford. These Prelates, it was stated, had their respective sees granted to them with an express clause, that their tenure was on condition of their good behaviour; but since, by preaching erroneous doctrines, and by an irregular life and conversation, they had demeaned themselves contrary to the laws of God and the practice of the Catholic Church, proceedings were about to be instituted against them according to the ecclesiastical laws. Since, however, they had manifestly forfeited their sees, the Commissioners were authorized to declare them vacant.

By virtue of these two commissions, seven Protestant Bishops were deprived, and the most eminent preachers of the reformed doctrines were either committed to public prisons, or placed under private restraint. A considerable number of the Clergy were dispossessed of their benefices, solely on account of their marriage; and though the number of the sufferers has been overstated<sup>e</sup>, yet there is no exag-

<sup>e</sup> Bishop Burnet vouches Archbishop Parker for the fact, that twelve thousand of the Clergy were deprived on account of their marriage, whereas the number of the English Clergy was computed only at sixteen thousand. The learned and accurate Henry Wharton, after

geration of the severity and injustice of the act. Some were convicted only on common fame; some were never cited to appear, and yet were deprived; some who were already in prison were cited, and, because they did not appear, were treated as guilty; an inconsiderable number were induced to quit their wives, in order to retain their livings. These were not the only acts of injustice; for many, even after they had been deprived, were obliged to separate from their wives. This last act of severity was founded on their pretended vow of chastity, though no such vow had been taken or required during the last reign. Even those regulars who had taken monastic vows, one of which is well known to have been a vow of chastity, on account of the dissolution of the monasteries, were exempted from it by the equity of the case.

When the second Parliament of Mary met, the Convocation also assembled after the usual form. The friends of the Reformation had complained with justice, that the disputation, in the preceding Convocation, had been conducted with gross partiality; that the most able divines, on the Protestant side, had been detained in prison, and excluded from any share in its debates; and that those who were permitted to attend were treated with rudeness, and prevented from a free declaration of their opinion. To silence these clamours, the resolution was adopted of sending Weston, the Prolocutor of the Lower House, with a delegation of divines to Oxford, and there to renew a disputation on the corporal presence, before the whole University. The Convocation and the two Universities were authorized, by letters patent from the Queen, to constitute a Committee for the management of the con-

having examined the number of Clergymen who were deprived in the archdiocese and peculiars of Canterbury, finds that, out of about three hundred benefices, seventy-three incumbents were deprived. This amounts to less than a fourth. Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. b. 5. p. 69.

troversy. As the Romish party, in the language of the Prolocutor, had the sword, they had the choice not only of their weapons, but of their antagonists. In selecting Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, they could not be accused of engaging in a sciomachy; but still an objection might be urged against the fairness of the contest. The three champions of the Protestant faith were sent to Oxford as prisoners. Like the great Apostle of the Gentiles, when he offered his eloquent apology for the Christian faith, they were "in bonds." A short space of two days only was allowed to them for preparation; they were kept in different prisons, were not suffered to converse together, and were denied the advantage of books and papers. They were obliged likewise to appear singly in the disputation against a host of opponents, acting in concert, and with all the advantages of previous study.

Since the rebellion of Wyat, on account of the number of prisoners in the Tower, Cranmer and Ridley, while in London, had been confined in the same apartment. By conferences with each other, and by joint prayers to the Spirit of Wisdom, they had mutually strengthened their conviction and animated their courage, and they received the intimation of their removal to Oxford, for the purpose of giving a public testimony of their faith, with gratitude and joy.

By the same authority under which the Committee of divines were appointed<sup>f</sup>, the three Protestant confessors were removed, and the Queen sent her precept to the Mayor and Bailiffs of Oxford, to bring the three prisoners into the Schools at the times appointed for disputation.

<sup>f</sup> The Committee consisted of Dr. Weston, Prolocutor; Dr. Tresham, Dr. Cole, Dr. Oglethorpe, Dr. Chedsey, Mr. Pye, Mr. John Harpsfield, and Mr. Fecknam, of Oxford; Dr. Young, Vice-Chancellor; Dr. Glyn, Dr. Seaton, Dr. Watson, Dr. Sedgwick, and Dr. Atkinson, from Cambridge.—Fox's *Acts and Monuments*. Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, part ii. b. v. p. 72.

The articles, or questions of disputation, were three : 1. Whether the natural Body of Christ be really in the Sacrament or not, after the words of consecration are spoken by the priest ? 2. Whether in the Sacrament, after the words of consecration, any other substance remains, except the Body and Blood of Christ ? Whether in the Mass there is a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead ?

The proceedings were opened with great state and solemnity, and, as a preliminary step, the questions being reduced into the form of articles, were subscribed by all the members of the Committee who had not before subscribed them, either at London or Cambridge. The Commissioners held their first session in the choir of St. Mary's church, and were seated before the Altar, "to the number of thirty-three persons<sup>s</sup>," Weston, the Prolocutor of the Convocation, being the President. Cranmer was the first of the prisoners introduced into this assembly, in custody of the Mayor, and in the habit of a Doctor. He stood before the Commissioners with his staff in his hand, and declined to accept the seat which was offered to him. The Prolocutor, stationed in the midst of the assembly, began with a short preface or speech in praise of Christian unity, and then directed his discourse to Cranmer. He stated, that the prisoner had been educated in the true Catholic faith, but that of late years he had separated himself from it, by teaching erroneous doctrines, and by setting forth every year a new system. For this reason, the Queen had sent himself and his colleagues, to bring back the heretic to the fold of Christ. Weston then exhibited the three Articles which had been already subscribed by the Convocation, to which he demanded the assent and subscription of Cranmer.

The Archbishop replied to this address with a gravity and persuasive modesty which drew tears from many in

<sup>s</sup> Fox's Acts and Monuments, Life of Latimer.

the assembly. He observed, that no man was so desirous of unity as himself; but it must be an unity in Christ, and founded in the truth. Having read the Articles three or four times, he desired an explanation of a term in the first Article, what was meant by “the true and natural Body of Christ,” whether an organisical or sensible body was intended? He was answered, though not without confusion and disagreement among the different speakers, that it meant the same Body which was born of the Virgin. On receiving this answer, he said that he was prepared to maintain the negative of all the questions, that they were false, and against God’s holy word, and if agreement in them were the conditions of unity, he must reject communion. The deportment of the Archbishop was conciliatory, and gained general commendation, and he was dismissed, after a day had been assigned to him for disputation.

On the removal of Cranmer, Ridley was brought in, and having heard the Articles read to him, answered without hesitation, that they were false, and that they sprung out of a sour and bitter root. “His answers were sharp and witty, and very learned.” The Commissioners attempted to fix a charge of inconsistency upon him, and asserted, that, ever since his promotion to a Bishopric, he had maintained the doctrine of Transubstantiation; but he satisfactorily repelled the imputation. Gardiner, the Lord Chancellor, having been mentioned as an evidence of his holding the doctrine of the Mass, Ridley boldly said, that if the Lord Chancellor reported any such thing, he reported what was untrue. On being asked if he were ready to dispute, he replied, that as long as God gave him life, not only his heart, but also his mouth and his pen, should be ready to defend divine truth; but he required time and books. He was informed that his demand of time could not be granted, but he should be furnished with books. The Articles were then given to him, and he was required, as Cranmer had been, to write his opinion on each.

Latimer was then summoned, and his appearance exhibited a striking contrast to that of the two Prelates. At his breast hung his New Testament and his spectacles ; in his hand he held his staff, which supported his feeble frame, and with difficulty he made his way through the crowd. Seating himself without ceremony in the chair which was placed for him, he heard the Articles read, and gave to them a plain denial. When told that he was expected to dispute, shaking his palsied head, he smiled and said, that he was equally fit to be governor of Calais. Still he was willing to declare his opinion, either in writing or in conference. He complained that he had been deprived of pen and ink since his confinement, and that he had no other book except his New Testament, which he had read over deliberately seven times, and yet could not find in it the Mass; “neither the marrow-bones nor sinews of the same.” The Prolocutor was not a little offended with the homeliness of this expression, and Latimer was forthwith remanded to the custody of the bailiff.

The disputation took place at the time appointed, and was continued on three successive days. Cranmer had the precedence, and on the first day was conducted to the respondent’s seat in the Divinity School, but still under the custody of the Mayor. The Prolocutor opened the disputation with a customary speech, but committed a blunder which raised the mirth of the audience<sup>h</sup>. Having discovered his error, he corrected it, and proceeded to say that it was not lawful to call in question the doctrine of the corporal presence, since it was taught by the express words of Christ Himself, and to doubt the truth of the Scriptures was the same as to doubt the truth and power of God.

<sup>h</sup> “Convenistis hodie fratres profligaturi detestandam illam hæresin de veritate corporis Christi in Sacramento, &c.” Fox’s Acts and Mon. vol. iii. p. 39. and Bishop Jewel’s Works.

To this exordium Cranmer, having first obtained licence, answered, that the purpose of their meeting was to discuss a question which was doubtful, and therefore a fit subject of disputation ; but the Prolocutor had affirmed it to be a certain truth, and if so, it was an unfit matter of discussion. It was, therefore, contrary to reason to dispute concerning a question which the Moderator had predetermined, and if it regarded an incontrovertible truth, to expect its confutation from him was absurd.

The disputation continued from the morning till past noon, but in a disorderly manner, and with many interruptions. It was carried on sometimes in English, and sometimes in Latin. Of Cranmer's opponents, Yonge, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, was esteemed the most able : but three hours had elapsed before the confusion permitted him to bear a part in the argument.

To dilate on the metaphysical arguments involved in the two first questions would be needless ; but on the last, concerning the propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, Cranmer was fully of opinion that to hold its affirmative was derogatory to the sacrifice on the Cross. If the Passion of Christ were sufficient for all the purposes of redemption, where was the necessity of any other ? The necessity of any succeeding supplemental oblations supposed the sacrifice of Christ to be defective ; and there could be no sacrifice under the Christian dispensation, except that of praise and thanksgiving, repentance, and works of charity.

The manner in which the disputation was terminated by the Prolocutor may readily be anticipated : " Thus you see, brethren, the truth stedfast and invincible ; you see also the craft and deceit of heretics ; the truth may be pressed, but cannot be oppressed : therefore cry altogether, *Vincit veritas ; The truth overcometh !*"

On the second day, Ridley was appointed to dispute, and his principal opponent was Smith. In the reign of Edward, it will be remembered that Smith was engaged

in a disputation on the corporal presence with Peter Martyr, but, in consequence of a persecution against him, had left the kingdom. He had afterwards sent to Cranmer a written recantation of the opinion which he had asserted with so much intemperance; but now he was prepared to join the triumphant Romanists, and once more to enter the lists as the defender of Transubstantiation. In the judgment which Philpot had expressed in the Convocation, that Ridley was the *Coryphaeus* of the Protestant doctrines, it is impossible not to concur, from the manner in which he acquitted himself on this day. The want of books was not felt, in consequence of the tenacity of his memory, though of the strength of this faculty, as of all his other talents, he spoke with diffidence<sup>i</sup>. In his quotations from the Fathers he was ready, and not less expert in rescuing them from the unfair interpretation of his antagonists. The line of argument which he pursued was not less judicious than his mode of managing it. Omitting the metaphysical arguments against Transubstantiation, which often led the disputants on each side into profane allusions, he applied himself to ascertain the belief of the primitive Church on this important doctrine<sup>k</sup>. The proposition which he established, by irrefragable proofs, was, that the Christian Church, for the first nine centuries, had no universally received opinion concerning the manner in which the Body and Blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist.

According to the account given by Ridley of the disputation, the greatest disorder prevailed, and it was inter-

<sup>i</sup> Strype's Eccles. Mem. vol. iii. c. 29. p. 386.

<sup>k</sup> Bertramu, or Ratramn, was again mentioned by Ridley as having first opened his eyes, or, in his own phrase, as "the first that pulled me by the ear." It was this author, he continueth, "which first brought me from the common error of the Romish Church, and caused me to search more diligently and exactly, both the Scriptures and the writings of the old ecclesiastical Fathers."

rupted by shouts, taunts, and reproaches : it resembled a stage of gladiators, rather than a school of divines ; and the noise of the Sorbonne, which had offended him while he was at Paris, was moderate when compared with the tumult in the Divinity School at Oxford. The disputation continued until the Prolocutor was wearied, and he ended it in a strain similar to that of the preceding day ; “ You see the obstinate, vain-glorious, crafty, and inconstant mind of this man ; but you see also, that the force of truth cannot be shaken : wherefore cry out with me, TRUTH HAS THE VICTORY !”

Latimer was brought into the School on the third day ; and he repeated what he had before said, that age had disqualified him from sustaining a disputation, but that he was willing to speak or to write his confession of faith. Whatever he had to say, he must say in English ; for during the last twenty years he had disused the Latin tongue<sup>1</sup>. He declared that, in his opinion, the presence of Christ in the Sacrament was purely spiritual, but as to the doctrine of the corporal presence, he considered it to be the root of all the other errors of the Church. He enlarged on the sacrament of the Mass, and the abuse of private communion ; he protested against denying the cup to the laity, and against worshipping God in an unknown tongue. He perceived that they laughed at him ; but he besought them to consider his age, to which some of that assembly might hereafter attain. They pressed him earnestly to engage in an argument ; but he persisted in his refusal, saying, that though his memory was weak, his faith was strong, and founded on the word of God. He entreated that he might be dismissed, and that they would deal with him as they chose. Weston, on his departure, appealed to the assembly in the same manner as he had done on the

<sup>1</sup> He had disused Latin ; he never understood Greek : “ I know no Greek.” Fox’s Acts and Mon., Life of Latimer.

two preceding days : “ Here you all see the weakness of heresy against truth.”

On the following day, Harpsfield kept an act for his Doctor’s Degree, and giving out the two first questions as his exercise, Cranmer was permitted to appear a second time in the school as an opponent. The arguments were chiefly metaphysical, and, after Cranmer had sustained his part for some time, he was dismissed by the prolocutor with commendation.

Thus the disputation ended, and two days afterwards the three prisoners were once more brought before the Delegates at Saint Mary’s church, and required to subscribe the articles. Weston having taunted Cranmer in particular with his failure in disputation, the Archbishop replied, that he was overborne by numbers and clamour, but that his opinion was unchanged, and that he persisted in his refusal to subscribe. Ridley and Latimer gave a similar reply, and then a sentence of condemnation was read, in which they were denounced as heretics and favourers of heresy. Being asked whether they would return to the bosom of the Church, while the sentence was reading, they severally appealed to heaven, not doubting, that, though ejected from the Romish Church, their names were enrolled in the blessed society above.

Before the prolocutor and the deputation left Oxford, Ridley requested to see the report which the notaries had taken of the disputation, and demanded permission to make corrections or additions to his statements and arguments : but this equitable request, though promised originally, was refused. Cranmer sent by Weston a petition, sealed and addressed to the Council; but Weston, having carried it a part of the way, presumed to break the seal. Having read it, and disliking its contents, he sent it back to the Archbishop, with a refusal to deliver it.

The disputation, and the sentence of the Delegates, were transmitted to the Council, and the opinion of the

judges was demanded, whether any ulterior measures might be legally taken? The three prisoners had been originally committed on a charge of different crimes, Cranmer for high treason, Ridley and Latimer for sedition, but no one of them for heresy. Cranmer had been already attainted for high treason, but Ridley and Latimer had not yet been brought to trial. In the present case, the three prisoners had been convicted of heresy and excommunicated by another tribunal, and by a court which sat under a royal warrant, but which was unknown to the law. The deputation without doubt consisted of members of the Lower House of Convocation, but the whole Convocation had not a legal right to excommunicate two of its members, or even to try them for heresy.

The authority of the Pope was not yet restored in England, and the authority of the Queen, in ecclesiastical matters, had been renounced by herself. She had prohibited the ecclesiastical courts from using her name in their processes, and the Convocation was the highest ecclesiastical court both of judicature and legislation. The opinion of the judges was therefore required, and the purport of that opinion may be conjectured by the result. Proceedings against the three prisoners were stayed until a third Parliament was called, and the authority of the Pope was restored<sup>i</sup>.

The Romanists were so highly elated with the issue of the disputation at Oxford, that they were emboldened to attempt a similar exhibition at Cambridge. They meditated to carry down Hooper, the late Bishop of Gloucester, Ferrar, Bishop of St. David's, with Philpot and Bradford; but the design was abandoned, in consequence of a declaration published by the subjects of their anticipated triumph. The prisoners unanimously refused to dispute except in the presence of the Queen and Council, or before either of the two Houses of Parliament. This

<sup>i</sup> Ridley's Life of Bishop Ridley, p. 513.

refusal was supported by the following reasons: 1. It was clear that the determinations of the Universities were already made, these two learned bodies having already shown their hostility to the Reformers, having condemned the Protestant cause without hearing it. 2. It was evident that the Romish Prelates and Clergy aimed rather at victory than truth, otherwise the Protestant Divines would have been fairly heard when they might have delivered their opinions without danger. 3. Those who were to be judges or moderators of the disputation were the inveterate enemies of the Reformers, and by the transactions of the Convocation in the last year, as well as from those which had lately taken place at Oxford, the treatment which they might expect at Cambridge could be easily foreseen. 4. They had been confined a long time in prison without books or papers, or a convenient place of study. 5. They knew that they should not be permitted to speak freely, but should be interrupted whenever their judges pleased. 6. They could not have the nomination of the notaries, who would on the contrary be chosen by their enemies, and consequently would make an incorrect and partial report of the proceedings.

These reasons had determined them not to engage in a public disputation; but still they were willing to state in writing a summary of their faith, in defence of which they were ready to offer themselves to the halter or the fire, as God should appoint. Their belief was, that "the Scriptures were the word of God, and the sole rule of controversy in matters of faith, and that the Church is to be obeyed so long as she follows the Scriptures." They also professed their belief "in the Creed of the Apostles, and the Creeds set forth by the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and by the first and fourth Councils of Toledo, and also in the symbols of Athanasius, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Damasius." They held "the doctrine of justification by faith; and by faith they meant

not merely an assent, but a certain persuasion, wrought by the Holy Ghost, which illuminated the mind, and softened the heart to submit itself unfeignedly to God."

"Though they acknowledged an inherent righteousness, yet they ascribed justification and the pardon of sin only to the imputed righteousness of Christ." "They thought that the service should be performed in a tongue understood by the people; that Christ alone was the object of prayer, and therefore the saints should not be invocated; that immediately after death the soul passes either to the state of the damned or blessed, without any intermediate state of purgatory; that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the two Sacraments of Christ, which ought to be administered according to His institution, and therefore they condemned the refusal of the cup to the people, and also transubstantiation, adoration, and the sacrifice of the mass; and, finally, they asserted, that marriage was lawful to every rank of men. These tenets they declared their readiness to defend, as they had often before offered to do, and concluded by admonishing the people not to engage in any rebellion against the Queen, but to obey her in all points, except when her commands were contrary to the law of God."

While freedom of debate and even personal liberty were denied to the Reformers, the Church of Rome was anxiously expecting the consummation of her triumph over England. The ratification of the treaty of marriage between Philip and Mary was soon followed by the marriage itself. Philip landed at Southampton, where he received all the marks of respect and submission due to royalty; the Queen met him at Winchester, where Gardiner solemnized their union. As soon as the solemnity was concluded, Figuera, the Emperor's ambassador, presented Philip with his father's resignation of the kingdoms of Sicily and Naples, and the King and Queen were mutually proclaimed Sovereigns of their respective dominions.

Although the Castilian haughtiness and reserve were unacceptable to the English, yet Philip attempted to relax, and to gain popular favour by extraordinary liberality, and by acts of grace and condescension. He brought with him an immense treasure<sup>k</sup>, which he dispensed with profuseness. At his first arrival he obtained the release of several persons of quality, among whom was the Archbishop of York. In opposition to the advice of Gardiner, he asserted the innocence of Lady Elizabeth, and Courtney, Earl of Devonshire, in the rebellion of Wyat, and procured for the Earl a complete release, and for Elizabeth an enlargement of the restrictions imposed on her liberty.

The third Parliament of Mary was now assembled, through the intervention of which she expected to complete the reconciliation of England with the see of Rome. Whatever might be the secret wishes of Gardiner, he was compelled to dissemble, and to forward the inclinations of his Sovereign. Cardinal Pole had remained in Germany during the last year, and had expressed great dissatisfaction at his detention; but before he could land on the English shore, it was necessary that his attainder should be reversed. To carry this measure through a Parliament, which was prepared to make greater sacrifices, and to surrender the liberties of England, was easy; and while the Bill of Repeal was in its progress, the Lords Paget and Hastings were sent to conduct the Cardinal to England.

Being now restored to all the rights and privileges of an English subject, Pole proceeded to revisit his native country after an absence of twenty years. What must have been his feelings on this occasion, it is impossible to describe. He entered the capital as a private person, without the solemnities of a Legate; for the papal authority

<sup>k</sup> According to Stowe, twenty-seven chests of silver bullion, each chest being a yard and four inches long; and a few months after, another remittance of gold and silver, which required ninety-nine horses and two carriages to convey it to the Tower.

had not been yet recognised. The chief obstacle to its restoration was an apprehension entertained by the temporality, that it must be accompanied by a restitution of the monastic property; and to allay this fear, a promise was given by the King and Queen, and private assurances were offered by the Legate, that no infringement of the existing state of property was intended.

This preliminary being adjusted, Pole communicated the purport of his legation, and the powers with which he was intrusted, to the King and Queen; and a royal message was then sent to the two Houses of Parliament, inviting their attendance to hear the Cardinal deliver his legation. On account of the Queen's indisposition, the Parliament met in the great chamber at Whitehall, and the two Sovereigns being seated in state, and the Lords and Commons in attendance, the Lord Chancellor, Gardiner, acquainted the two Houses with the object of the Cardinal's visit to England, adding a high encomium on his character.

After this recommendation the Cardinal rose, and delivered a long and eloquent oration. Having first returned thanks to the Queen and the two Houses for the personal favour bestowed on himself, that of reversing his attainder, and of enabling him to appear before them with safety and honour, he informed them that, as they had been graciously pleased to restore him to his birthright, so his business was to restore the nation to its ancient dignity. He had been sent to the people of England by the common Pastor of Christendom, to bring back those who had strayed so long from the fold of the Church. "If we enquire into the English schism," continued the Cardinal, "we shall find avarice and sensuality the principal motives, and that it was caused by the unbridled appetite and licentiousness of a single person. Though it was given out that there would be a vast accession of wealth to the public, yet this expectation vanished. The Crown was left in debt, and

the subject, generally speaking, more impoverished than ever; and as to religion, the people were rigorously tied to forms, and fettered by penalties; and to speak plainly, there was more liberty of conscience in Turkey than in England." "Though the Apostolic See might have recovered its jurisdiction by force, and had the offer of the greatest Princes in Europe to assist its just pretensions, yet this advantage was waved, and none but gentle expedients were adopted." Having asserted that "the power of the keys and the government of the Church belonged to the see of Rome by the delegation of Christ;" and having enlarged on his legatine authority, he ended with a solemn declaration, "that he had no prejudicial instructions against any person." "My commission," he said, "is not to pull down, but to build ; to reconcile, not to censure ; to invite, without compulsion. My business is not to proceed by way of retrospection, or to question things already settled. As for past errors, they shall be overlooked and forgotten : but, to qualify yourselves for the pardon now offered, it is necessary to repeal those laws which have broken the catholic unity, and divided you from the society of the Church."

This speech, delivered with great dignity, could not fail of being heard with impression; and on the following day, the Speaker reported the substance of the Legate's speech, and a message was brought from the Lords desiring a conference. At this conference a petition was prepared, and after having been previously submitted to a Committee, received the assent of both Houses<sup>1</sup>. It was in the form of a supplication to the King and Queen, and contained an acknowledgment of the guilt which the nation had incurred by its "most horrible defection and schism from

<sup>1</sup> Sir Ralph Bagnal refused to consent to the reconciliation of England with the See of Rome; many more in the House of Commons were of the same mind, but had not courage to speak out. Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. fol. p. 204.

the Apostolic See, and of sincere contrition for its error." As a proof of repentance, the Parliament was ready to repeal all the laws enacted in prejudice of the Holy See; and "since the King and Queen had not been defiled in any way by the schism of the nation, their intercession with the Legate was earnestly implored, that England might receive absolution for her heresy, and be re-admitted into the bosom of the Catholic Church." This petition being presented to the King and Queen by both Houses on their knees, the desired intercession was made to the Legate, which he graciously condescended to accept.

The acceptance of the royal mediation was announced by the Cardinal in a speech to both Houses. Having again thanked them for the personal favour shown to himself in reversing his attainder, he congratulated himself on being able to recompense the obligation by restoring them to the body of the Church. Some of the Members having risen, with a view of seconding the royal mediation, the Cardinal, to spare them the mortification, prevented their request, and said, that he was ready to give the absolution which they had so earnestly implored. After his legatine commission had been read<sup>m</sup>, he declared how acceptable the return of a sinner was to God Almighty, and that the holy angels rejoiced at the recovery of their kingdom; and then the Members of both Houses being on their knees, he pronounced a solemn absolution, releasing the whole realm from all the penalties of heresy and schism, and restoring it to the unity of the holy Church, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

After the absolution was pronounced, a solemn procession was made to the chapel royal, where a Te Deum was sung; and because this reconciliation to the communion of the [Roman] Catholic Church took place on Saint Andrew's day, the Cardinal procured an Ordinance

<sup>m</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. Appendix, No. lxxiii.

to be passed in Convocation, for observing the festival annually, with all the solemnity of the greater holydays. The remainder of the day was spent in festivity, and on the following Sunday the submission of the two Houses of Parliament to the Papal authority, and the absolution given by the Cardinal, were declared by the Lord Chancellor, in a sermon at Saint Paul's Cross. Among other matters, he told his auditory, 'that when King Henry the Eighth was pressed with a rebellion in the north, he resolved to restore the Pope's supremacy; but this resolution came to nothing; the hour was not yet come; for had the matter been adjusted under such circumstances of difficulty, some would have said, that the King had been overawed into justice.' 'After this, himself and Knevett were sent ambassadors to the Emperor, to request his mediation between the Pope and the King; but the time was not yet come; for his compliance at that crisis might have been construed into motives of state policy. In the beginning of King Edward's reign, the business of reconciliation was moved, but neither was that a proper time; for the King being then a child, he could not have had a share in the submission. But the present was in every respect the fit time, which Providence seemed to have reserved for so great a blessing.'

An embassy was then sent to the Pope, offering a tender of the submission of England to the Holy See; and when the intelligence of the reconciliation reached Rome, a solemn procession was ordered to take place throughout all Italy. The Pope confirmed the proceedings of his Legate, and proclaimed a jubilee, with a clause in the Bull to account for anticipating the period. Like the father of the prodigal, he said, that it was fit to express an unusual joy for the recovery of the son which was lost<sup>n</sup>.

The Parliament performed with fidelity the conditions on which the absolution had been granted, and by a single

<sup>n</sup> Fr. Paolo, Hist. Conc. Trent, vol. ii. p. 18.

Act repealed all the laws enacted in prejudice of the Holy See, since the twentieth year of Henry the Eighth, and the obnoxious Statutes were specifically enumerated. But to quiet all suspicion, and to remove all occasion of discontent, the Convocation was prevailed on to address the King and Queen, praying them to intercede with the Legate, that the restitution of Church lands might not be enforced. The address was presented to the Legate by the Lord Chancellor, the Prolocutor, and six other members of the Lower House; and the Parliament, in the Bill of Repeal, moved, in the form of an address to the King and Queen, that the Cardinal, by virtue of his commission, might dispense in the following cases: first, that all Bishoprics, Cathedrals, Colleges, Hospitals, and Schools, legally established since the schism, might be confirmed; secondly, that marriages contracted within such degrees as are not contrary to the laws of God might be confirmed, and the issue declared legitimate; thirdly, that all institutions to benefices, and other ecclesiastical promotions, might be valid; fourthly, that all judicial processes in the Ecclesiastical Courts, made according to the laws of the realm, might be ratified; and, fifthly, that all alienations of the lands belonging to any Bishoprics, Monasteries, or other religious houses, might continue as they were, without molestation from any ecclesiastical censures, canons, or constitutions<sup>o</sup>.

The Cardinal granted a full confirmation of all these articles, but in the conclusion of the dispensation, laid a heavy charge on those who had ecclesiastical property in their hands to make restitution. Parliament was not remiss in enforcing this charge, for, to encourage benefactions to the Church, the Statute of Mortmain was repealed for the next twenty years.

Although the Church of Rome was now established by law, yet it had still to encounter the formidable opposition

<sup>o</sup> Stat. 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8.

of public opinion. The learning and piety of the reformed Clergy could not but command the respect even of their enemies, and by their assiduity in their pastoral care, they had not only gained the affection of the people, but the people had made considerable advances in religious knowledge, and it was impossible to bring them back to the gross superstition in which they had been formerly enveloped. Since, therefore, there was so large a body of the English nation not to be brought under the authority of the Romish Church, even by the example of their Sovereigns, and the authority of a Parliament, it was a question worthy of deliberation, how so considerable a number of schismatics might be reclaimed.

There were now two parties both in the Church and in the State, respectively headed by Pole and Gardiner. Pole had once been suspected, if not of an inclination to the Protestant doctrines, yet of an improper lenity towards the Protestants. Under his present delicate position, as it regarded the English Government and the Apostolic See, he was compelled to alter his outward demeanour, though the liberality of his temper was the same. He knew the jealousy with which he was regarded by Gardiner, who would not fail to misrepresent his actions, and to embroil him, if possible, with the Queen, or with the See of Rome. For this reason, he was solicitous to express in public his detestation of heresy, and in private he restrained his natural love of society, and freedom of conversation, admitted few Englishmen into his familiarity, but lived chiefly with two Italians, whom he had brought over with him, and who had long shared his confidence and followed his fortunes, Priuli and Ormaneto. The friendship of one of his countrymen he still cultivated, the ex-secretary Cecil. With the accession of Mary, Cecil had quitted public life; he was known to be attached to the Protestant faith, and therefore refused to take a share in the new government. His retirement

was gladdened by the congenial society of Pole, and the intimacy of Cecil and Pole must be recorded, as being equally honourable to both.

Whatever abhorrence Pole was compelled to express against heresy, yet with respect to the treatment of heretics, he hesitated not to profess himself an enemy to all severity. ‘*Pastors*,’ he said, ‘ought to have compassion on their straying sheep; Bishops were fathers who ought to reclaim their undutiful children. There was a wide distinction between a nation uninfected with heresy, and a nation overrun with heretical teachers. The people were not to be brought back from their errors either suddenly or violently, but time must be allowed before they could be expected to return. Therefore he proposed to begin the work of reformation by correcting the manners of the Clergy. In every country of Christendom’ he had observed, ‘that the vices and ignorance of the priesthood had been the cause of heretical doctrines, and his aim and intention was to revive the discipline of the primitive Church.’

Gardiner, as well from natural disposition as from rivalry to Pole, advised a different course: he proposed that the penal laws against heretics should be enforced; for he was convinced that error could be repressed only by timely severity. He ‘well remembered that the Lollards had increased when Cardinal Wolsey remitted the execution of the old Statutes against heresy; and that when the Statute of the Six Articles was passed, many heretics either openly recanted, or submitted in silence. He was confident that the preachers of the new doctrines then in prison would comply rather than suffer the extremity of punishment, or that a few examples would operate as a salutary warning to the rest. He was not disposed to deny that the Clergy wanted a reformation; but care should be taken that such a notion might not be avowed publicly, since a clamour would be raised,

and an aversion of the people from their pastors would be encouraged.'

The Queen adopted as much of the counsel both of Pole and Gardiner as corresponded with her own inclination. She encouraged Pole to go on with his design of correcting the manners of the Clergy, and of reviving primitive discipline, and she instigated Gardiner to proceed with severity against heretics. Pole, when the Bishops waited on him at Lambeth to receive his benediction, exhorted them to return to their respective charges, and to treat their flocks with gentleness. Gardiner, as Lord Chancellor, possessed a control over the legatine authority of Pole, and, as the chief law officer of the realm, prepared to suppress heresy by a vigorous execution of the Statutes.

The House of Commons, which had been foremost in the late compliances, and had even outstripped the Romish Bishops in their zeal for the Romish religion, had revived all the Statutes of Richard the Second, Henry the Fourth, and Henry the Fifth, against heretics<sup>p</sup>. Those princes, who incorporated into the penal code the sanguinary laws against heretics, were also distinguished for their resistance against Papal usurpation. The first Sovereign of the Lancastrian line, while he condemned the Lollards to the flames, rigidly enforced the law against those who obtained 'provisors' from Rome; it was reserved for the reign of Mary to connect the restoration of the Papal supremacy with the revival of persecution on account of conscience.

<sup>p</sup> Stat. 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 6.

## CHAPTER XIII.

The Marian Persecution.—Its duration.—Numbers who suffered.—Rogers, the Protomartyr in the Protestant Cause.—Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester.—Sanders and Taylor.—Gardiner hesitates.—Ferrar, Bishop of Saint David's.—Bradford, and his Controversy with his Fellow-Prisoners concerning Predestination.—Cranmer cited to appear before the Pope's Sub-Delegate.—Ridley and Latimer before the Representative of Cardinal Pope.—Death of Ridley and Latimer.—Death of Gardiner.—Philpot executed.—Recantation and Death of Cranmer.—Pole succeeds to the See of Canterbury.—Ecclesiastical Administration of Pole.—Death of Mary and of Pole.

IF a recital of the following events served no other purpose than to exasperate and inflame, to revive animosities which ought to be forgotten, and to cherish a remembrance which ought to be obliterated, the abridgment or even the suppression of the narrative could require no apology. Different, however, is the spirit in which the Christian recalls to his memory those illustrious confessors of their faith, “of whom the world was not worthy.” Let his feeling be analysed; and though, like every human feeling, every human motive, and every human action, it is not unalloyed, yet it is salutary; for it is pious, and it is charitable. Gratitude to God, the giver of every good gift; reverence for His chosen servants, on whom He bestowed such an abundant measure of holy fortitude; stedfastness in that religion, for which they were contented to resign “life itself;” these are the sentiments which predominate in his mind, and abhorrence of the persecutor is completely extinguished in admiration of the martyr.

In detailing the Marian persecution of the Reformers, far be it from any Protestant to aggravate its severity or its guilt; let him convert it to a more noble end, to

strengthen his conviction, and to animate his courage. But, at the same time, let him not shrink from vindicating the martyrology of the Church of England, through fear of incurring the scoffs of the infidel, or the rage of the bigot; let him show, that the characters of those who are recorded in its pages are deserving of that veneration with which he regards them; and that, though their qualities were different, and their talents unequal<sup>a</sup>, yet they were all placed far above the suspicion of folly or fanaticism.

The Marian persecution, with respect to its duration, lasted four years, beginning with the reconciliation of England to the See of Rome, and ending only with the life of Mary. There were undoubtedly short intervals of remission in cruelty; for it was observed, that, during the session of Parliament, the chief actors abated in their fury, but when the Parliament had risen, the work of destruction began with renewed zeal.

The numbers of those who suffered have been differently estimated. Whittingham, the author of the preface to a treatise by Ridley on the Lord's Supper, asserts, that, in the two first years of this reign, more than eight hundred were put to death on account of religion: Fox has calculated the whole amount, and stated it far below this: but the authority on which the historian will be disposed to rely is that of Cecil; he affirms in his book, entitled "The Execution of Justice," that those who died by

<sup>a</sup> "Comparisons, I know, are odious, and the more when made betwixt persons of eminence; however, to such as peruse the whole story, these proportions will appear true. Of all the Marian Martyrs, Mr. Philpot was the best born gentleman; Bishop Ridley the profoundest scholar; Mr. Bradford the holiest and devoutest man; Archbishop Cranmer, of the mildest and meekest temper; Bishop Hooper, of the sternest and austerest nature; Dr. Taylor had the merriest and pleasantest wit; Mr. Latimer had the plainest and simplest heart. Oh! the variety of these instruments! Oh! their joint harmony in a consort to God's glory!" Fuller's Church Hist. b. viii. p. 21.

imprisonment, torments, famine, and fire, were nearly four hundred<sup>r</sup>.

Rogers has the honour of being the protomartyr in the cause of the Protestant faith. Cambridge was the place of his education; but, at an early period of life, he was appointed Chaplain to the English factory at Antwerp. Having there formed an acquaintance with Tindal and Coverdale, he assisted them in their translation of the Bible, and having been convinced, by a diligent perusal of the Holy Scriptures, that "marriage is honourable in all," he entered into that state. Quitting his Chaplaincy at Antwerp, he had afterwards the charge of a Dutch congregation at Wittenburg, until the accession of Edward the Sixth, when he was induced to return to England. Ridley distinguished him by his patronage, and having been appointed by that Prelate a Prebendary of Saint Paul's, the Chapter elected him their lecturer in divinity. Soon after the accession of Mary, he delivered a sermon in the cathedral of Saint Paul, in which he fearlessly asserted the doctrines which he had long taught, and exhorted the people to continue in them, and to beware of popery, idolatry, and superstition. When he preached this sermon, the Protestant was the established faith, and the assertion of the Protestant doctrines, far from being a crime, was a duty. Yet he was summoned before the Council to answer for his conduct, but defended himself with such resolution, that he was dismissed.

<sup>r</sup> Bishop Burnet reckons the number of sufferers to be two hundred and eighty-four. But Strype, in his Ecclesiastical Memoirs, vol. iii. Appendix, p. 554, has preserved an exact catalogue of the numbers, the places, and times of execution:

In 1555	there were	71
.. 1556	.....	89
.. 1557	.....	88
.. 1558	.....	40
<hr/>		
Total		288
<hr/>		

Immediately after the proclamation for prohibiting unlicensed preachers, Rogers was again summoned before the Council, and commanded to remain a prisoner in his own house. By his friends, who knew that he was peculiarly obnoxious to the Government, he was exhorted, while he was yet at liberty, to provide for his safety, and to fly; but, though he had an infant family, he refused to desert his public duty as a minister of the Gospel. At length, by the instigation of Boner, he was removed from his own house to Newgate, where he remained until a resolution was adopted by the Government of enforcing the Statutes against heresy. As he was esteemed one of the most learned among the Reformers, he was first selected to render an account of his faith, and to undergo the trial whether he would renounce his opinions, or confirm them by his death. Accordingly, he was brought before the Council, and, having displayed the most undaunted courage in his vindication of the Protestant faith, was condemned as a heretic, and delivered over to the secular power. Before his execution, he requested that he might be allowed an interview with his wife, in order to give her his last injunctions concerning the education of his children; but his request was refused, with the taunt that she was not his wife. When brought to the stake at Smithfield, he was not permitted to speak to the people, but he exhorted those around him to continue with steadfastness in that faith for which he was about to suffer. After the usual form, a pardon was offered to him at the stake if he would recant; but he refused it with inflexible constancy, and cheerfully met death<sup>s</sup>.

Hooper, the late Bishop of Gloucester, was condemned<sup>t</sup>

<sup>s</sup> *Acts and Mon.* vol. iii. p. 108.

<sup>t</sup> He was condemned on three separate points; first, for maintaining the lawfulness of the marriage of the Clergy; secondly, for his doctrine concerning divorce; and, thirdly, for denying the corporal presence. See Burnet's *Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec.* vol. iii. b. v. no. 35.

on the same day with Rogers; but to aggravate his punishment, as it was supposed, he was sent down to the city over which he once presided. The determination was received with joy, since he hoped that, by his death, he might confirm the faith of those over whom he had been constituted the spiritual director. During his confinement, he had been solaced by the affectionate communications of Ridley. These two Prelates had formerly disagreed on the question of the vestments; but all minor differences were now subdued by their conscientious devotion to the same great truths of the Gospel. That each of these eminent men retained his opinion on the question which had once divided them is evident: there is no reason to suppose that Hooper was reconciled to the use of the prescribed habits; and Ridley gave his last testimony to their propriety by going to the stake in his episcopal attire. But the latter, after having excused his remissness in leaving two letters unanswered, which Hooper had written to him, thus adverted to the subject with his wonted delicacy: “But now, my dear brother, forasmuch as I understand by your works, which I have but superficially seen, that we thoroughly agree, and wholly consent, in those things which are the grounds and substantial points of our religion, against which the world so furiously rages in these our days; howsoever, in times past, in certain bye matters and circumstances of religion, your wisdom and my simplicity, I grant, hath a little jarred, each of us following the abundance of his own sense and judgment; now, I say, be you assured that, even with my whole heart, God is my witness, in the bowels of Christ, I love you in the truth, and for the truth’s sake which abideth in us, and as I am persuaded shall, by the grace of God, abide in us for ever.”

The firmness of Hooper was assailed in his last moments

<sup>u</sup> Acts and Mon. Coverdale’s Letters of the Martyrs. Lond. 1837.  
p. 33.

by the usual temptation of placing before his eyes the royal pardon, on condition of his recantation; but, on seeing it, he exclaimed, "If you love my soul, away with it." The treatment which Hooper experienced was aggravated by the circumstance, that he was one of the most forward in supporting the title of Mary to the Crown. To his own unimpeachable loyalty and fidelity he thus appealed feelingly in his dying moments; "I am no traitor; neither needed you to have forced me to the place where I must suffer, for if ye had willed I would have gone thither alone."

Sanders was next condemned, and suffered at Coventry; and Taylor was burnt in his own parish of Hadleigh. When he was at the stake, he told his flock that he had taught them nothing but God's holy word, and that he was now about to seal his doctrine with his blood. His address was interrupted by one of the guards, who struck him on the head, and his devotions were disturbed in a similar manner.

At this period, Gardiner seems to have relented; he had always contended, that the dread of the flames would induce the Reformers to recant, or that a few instances of severity would bring the rest to a compliance. But, even in this early stage of persecution, he perceived that he had formed an erroneous estimate of the courage and sincerity of the Reformers. To stop the progress of that persecution which he had instigated was beyond his power; but he was contented to resign the management and, if possible, the responsibility of the sanguinary work to Boner, who was not troubled by any "compunctionous visitings of nature."

The whole nation was astonished and panic-stricken at the events which had already taken place. Even those who were indifferent concerning religion were startled at seeing the severity of these proceedings, and the blame of promoting them was, in the public opinion, divided. The

Queen, on her accession, had issued a declaration, that she would not compel any of her subjects to embrace her own faith ; but Gardiner and the other Privy-Councillors exonerated themselves from the charge of persecution, and publicly averred that they were only instruments under a higher direction. Philip was loaded with the heaviest weight of censure ; the haughtiness and reserve of his demeanour, his national bigotry, and his hereditary antipathy to the Reformation, conspired to fasten on him the principal guilt. So deeply involved was he in the imputation, that his Confessor, a Franciscan Friar<sup>x</sup>, largely inveighed in a sermon against persecution on account of religion. In plain terms, he laid the charge on the English Bishops, and farther said, that they never could have learned the lesson in the holy Scriptures. The word of God inculcated a different doctrine, that gainsayers should be instructed in the spirit of meekness, and not that they should be burned, under a pretext of rescuing them from eternal fire<sup>y</sup>.

The Bishops were surprised to find that these proceedings were condemned by a Spanish Friar, and thought themselves obliged to protest that they had no participation in advising this persecution. And, in fact, the sermon of the Friar could not turn the current of public opinion. The King and Queen were justly considered as the chief agents ; and undeniable evidence<sup>z</sup> remains to prove, that both these Sovereigns addressed a letter to Boner, complaining of the remissness of the Bishops in punishing heretics, and requiring them to proceed to extremities, if milder methods were unsuccessful.

The first intermission of persecution was short, and it was soon renewed with greater fury. It is painful to

<sup>x</sup> Alphonso à Castro, well known for his treatise "De Hæresibus."

<sup>y</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 612.

<sup>z</sup> Acts and Mon. Rapin's Hist. of England. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. ii. no. 20.

relate, that Boner was not only active in procuring the conviction of heretics, but that he delighted in inflicting tortures on the condemned to procure a recantation. In some cases he resorted to mercenary arguments, and offered, without success, a considerable sum to a youth judicially accused before him<sup>a</sup>.

From many of inferior rank who were sacrificed at this second period, must be selected Ferrar, late Bishop of St. David's, a man of uncouth manners, and of domestic habits not suitable to his sacred function. In the reign of Edward, articles had been exhibited against him, but the frivolous and absurd nature of some of these charges induces a suspicion that the whole were the offspring of malignity. They were, notwithstanding, thought of sufficient importance to justify his being committed to prison, and he continued a prisoner throughout the whole reign. When Mary succeeded, he was brought before Gardiner, and, it is thought, that if his deportment had been conciliatory, he might have secured his life without any sacrifice of conscience; but his uncourtly behaviour provoked Gardiner to leave him to the law. He was carried from London to Caermarthen, and condemned as a heretic by Morgan, his successor, for marrying after having taken monastic vows; for maintaining justification by faith only; and for denying transubstantiation and the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. Having made an appeal to Cardinal Pole, which was rejected, he suffered with extraordinary courage, declaring that his inflexibility in enduring his torments should be the test of his own sincerity, and of the truth of his doctrines.

A second interval of persecution now occurred, yet it was not of long duration, and the third period was marked by the death of Bradford. The name of this divine is connected with a controversy which at this time unhappily existed among the Reformers, and which was continued

<sup>a</sup> See Maitland's Essays, no. xx.

long after Bradford and his opponents were no more. He was a Prebendary of St. Paul's, and was, in the reign of Edward, a celebrated preacher; but he is said, and perhaps without extravagance, to have rendered as much service to the Reformation by his letters in prison, as by his discourses from the pulpit<sup>b</sup>. He was often removed from one prison to another, but wherever he was confined, he so far conciliated his keepers, that they suffered him to preach and to administer the Communion to his fellow-prisoners.

In doctrine, Bradford was a supralapsarian; but many of those who were in confinement for the profession of the Gospel denied absolute predestination, and asserted free will. They were men of strict and holy lives, but warm in their opinions, and not gentle in their mode of asserting those tenets which they sincerely believed<sup>c</sup>. Bradford, not less fixed in his own belief, was apprehensive that the tenets of his opponents would be highly injurious, if propagated, and set himself to oppose them in a treatise on "the holy election and predestination of God." In concert with Ferrar, Taylor, and Philpot, at the time when he sent his treatise, he wrote to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, then imprisoned at Oxford, soliciting their advice and agreement, and stating, that if they gave their testimony of approbation to the treatise, "the rest of the eminent ministers in and about London were ready to sign it also<sup>d</sup>."

<sup>b</sup> Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. iii. p. 85.

<sup>c</sup> Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. iii. p. 89. Their names were Hart, Trew, and Abingdon. Trew wrote on account of the "Contention," which has been published by Archbishop Laurence, in the first volume of his tracts, from a manuscript in the Bodleian Library.

<sup>d</sup> Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, b. iii. c. xiv. p. 503. "Upon this occasion, Ridley wrote a treatise of God's predestination and election, and Bradford wrote another upon the same subject, and sent it to these three fathers in Oxford for their approbation; and THEIRS BEING

There are no documents by which the sentiments of Cranmer and Latimer can be ascertained; but fortunately a letter from Ridley to Bradford still remains, and which clearly shews the opinion of that eminent Prelate on the abstruse questions, concerning which Bradford contended with so much intemperate eagerness. That Bradford, in the judgment of Ridley, laid too great a stress on these doctrines, is indisputable: Ridley thought that Bradford had over-rated both “the importance of the controversy and the influence of his adversaries<sup>e</sup>. ” But it may be also fairly concluded, from the letter of Ridley, that he could not go so far as Bradford in the doctrines of election and predestination. After having stated that he had selected all the passages in the New Testament which had a bearing on these points, and that he had written remarks on the several texts, he summed up the matter in a sentence, which, for its moderation and its humility, can never be repeated without good effect: “Sir, in those matters I am so fearful, that I dare not speak farther, yea, almost none otherwise than the texte dothe, as it wer, lead me by the hand<sup>f</sup>. ” Whether Bradford retained his sentiments is immaterial; for if he did not change his opinions, he moderated his violence. When he found that he was unable to convince his fellow-sufferers, he desired that they might pray for each other. “I love you,” he wrote to them, “though you have taken it otherwise without cause; I am going before you to my God and your God, to my Father and your Father, to my Christ and your Christ, to my home and your home<sup>g</sup>. ”

Another sufferer, named Careless, and Philpot, the late

*obtained, the rest of the eminent ministers in and about London were willing to sign it also.* ” The words of Strype are conditional, and not affirmative.

<sup>e</sup> Wordsworth’s Eccles. Biog. Life of Ridley, note, p. 872.

<sup>f</sup> Coverdale’s Letters of the Martyrs, pp. 64, 65. ed. 1564.

<sup>g</sup> Neal’s Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. iii. p. 89.

Archdeacon of Winchester, were involved in the same controversy; and the awful state of these prisoners, all in bonds for their adherence to the Protestant faith, and all in expectation of an excruciating death, could not check their propensity to disputation on questions the most remote from practice, even if they were not beyond the reach of human comprehension. They wrote against one another during their imprisonment, and were anxious to give publicity to their dissensions. Their unchristian conduct gave advantage to the common enemies, the Papists: these could now retort, that there was no security against error but within the pale of the Catholic Church, and that intolerance was inseparably connected with heresy.

After many other victims had been consigned to the flames, the three illustrious Confessors of the Protestant faith, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, were called to bear their final testimony. More than a year had elapsed since their disputation, and from that period they had continued in imprisonment at Oxford. They were confined in separate prisons, and of the three "concaptives," Ridley enjoyed the least liberty. Since the decision of the judges, that the Court by which they were condemned as heretics had no authority to pronounce such a sentence, and that it had no validity, their fate appears to have been undecided, but they considered it as certain. The serenity with which they awaited the approach of death in its most terrible form was indeed wonderful, and may infuse courage into the feeble-minded, and strike awe into the profane. A letter from Ridley to Grindal, once his friend and chaplain, but now in exile, proves that he was not only prepared for the event, but also for the time. Pole and Gardiner had been sent on an embassy to France, and the Queen was in daily expectation of issue: as soon as the ambassadors had returned, and the delivery of the Queen had taken place, the three Prelates expected their final release<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>h</sup> Post illorum magistratum nostrorum redditum, et partum reginæ

The last event, happily for the security of the Protestant religion, never happened ; the first was, according to the expectation of Ridley, the harbinger of their triumphant end. The Bishops of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Bristol, having received a special commission from the Pope, and a licence from the King and Queen, repaired to Oxford. These Prelates had authority to receive Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer into the bosom of the Church, in case they recanted their heretical errors ; but in case of contumacy, had authority to degrade them from their spiritual functions, and to deliver them for punishment to the secular power.

The Bishop of Gloucester presided in the process against Cranmer, acting as sub-delegate to the Cardinal de Puteo ; but in the process against Ridley and Latimer, the Bishop of Lincoln presided, acting as the representative of Cardinal Pole. Cranmer was first cited to appear before the Commissioners, and the place of their session was the choir of Saint Mary's Church. On the right hand of the President was seated Martin, and on his left hand Storey, two Doctors of Civil Law, and attending as Commissioners in behalf of the King and Queen.<sup>i</sup>"

The Archbishop having been brought before the Commissioners, under the custody of the Mayor, was cited to answer certain accusations of blasphemy, incontinence,

quem jam quotidiè expectamus, et jam aliquamdiu expectavimus, quemque Deus pro Sui nominis gloriâ dignetur bene illi fortunari, nos tunc statim nihil aliud quam nostræ confessionis de hoste nostro antiquo triumphalis, in Domino coronas expectamus. Coverdale's Letters of the Martyrs, p. 40.

<sup>i</sup> There was a previous meeting of the Commissioners in Saint Mary's Church, on Monday, September 9, as appears from Bishop Brookes's official report of this whole process, transmitted by him to Rome to the Cardinal de Puteo, whose delegate he was. The business of that day was to open the commission, to cite the Archbishop, and to agree upon other preliminaries.—Lambeth MSS. No. 1136. Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. note, vol. iii. p. 517.

and heresy. On his first appearance, being habited as a Doctor in Divinity, and having taken a survey of those who were constituted his judges, he acknowledged, by outward marks of reverence, the Commissioners of the King and Queen; but on being admonished to shew a similar mark of respect to the delegate of the Pope, he answered, that he had taken a solemn oath never to admit the authority of the Pope within the realm of England. This oath he intended, by the grace of God, to keep, and would never consent, by any sign or token, to acknowledge the papal jurisdiction. By this refusal he disclaimed any personal offence to the Bishop, whom he would have honoured as well as the others, if he had the same commission.

A long oration was then delivered by the President, in the proœmium of which he declared, that he was sent by the Pope, and by the King and Queen, on a message of peace and kindness; and if his embassy proved successful, it would be a matter of the greatest joy and comfort to himself. He then gave a highly-coloured description of the conduct of Cranmer, while he occupied the high station of Archbishop of Canterbury, reproaching the Archbishop with having yielded to the unlawful desires of Henry the Eighth. This was the beginning of his error, and the cause of his future calamities. "When," said the President, addressing himself to Cranmer, "you had forsaken God, God forsook you, and gave you over unto your own will, and suffered you to fall from schism to apostasy, from apostasy to heresy, from heresy to perjury, from perjury to treason, and so in conclusion into the full indignation of our sovereign Prince, which you may think a just punishment of God for your abominable opinions."

Martin followed Brookes in the same course of argument. He said, that "he and his colleague, Storey, appeared on behalf of the King and the Queen, that these two Sovereigns had returned to the unity of the true and

catholic Church, and had petitioned the Pope to resort to this process ;" but he added, " that the most ample benefit of the laws should be allowed to the Archbishop." At the conclusion of his speech, he exhibited certain articles, containing charges of adultery and perjury, and of editing heretical books, composed either by Cranmer himself, or by his encouragement and authority.

The Archbishop having obtained licence to reply, he first fell on his knees with his face toward the west, and repeated the Lord's Prayer, then rising, he recited the Articles of the Creed. This done, he offered a protestation, which, by his desire, was recorded, that whatever answer he might make, was not to be interpreted as an acknowledgment of the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome within the realm of England. After his protestation, he began by paying a due tribute to the learning and eloquence of the Bishop of Gloucester, though he refused to submit to the delegate of the Pope. " It was not his intention to impugn the elaborate representation of his conduct into which the Bishop had entered. He acknowledged with thankfulness all the blessings of God, and did not praise him less for his present affliction than for his past prosperity. The greatest grief which he at this time felt was to see the degradation of the Majesty of England. The Proctors of the King and Queen were his accusers before a subject of their own, and that subject receiving his commission from a foreign power. The jurisdiction of the Pope was so incompatible with the sovereignty of the King, that to be true to both was impossible ;" and he then emphatically asked, " ALAS! WHAT HATH THE POPE TO DO IN ENGLAND ?" " He reflected with anguish on the conduct of the Queen, who took a solemn oath, on the day of her Coronation, to observe all the laws and liberties of England, and had since taken an oath to maintain the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. The sovereignty of England was incompatible with the supremacy

of the Pope, and the two oaths were consequently so contradictory, that in respect of one of them she must be forsown. It was absurd to say, that the spiritual and temporal authority might be independent of each other, for he adduced many instances of opposition between the laws of the realm and the pontifical law. On this account, he would never consent to admit the authority of the Pope, whatever name it might assume, into the realm of England; an authority derogatory from its dignity, and subversive of its liberties."

" As for the heresy with which he had been charged, he was ignorant that he had maintained any; but if it were heretical to deny the authority of the Pope, then the Apostles and ancient Fathers were guilty of heresy. The Pope had introduced gods of his own creation, and boasted that by his canons and decrees he could dispense against Peter, against Paul, against the Old and New Testaments, and in the plenitude of his power may do as much as God."

" Concerning the Sacrament, he had taught no false doctrine; for if it could be proved from any ancient writer of an older date than the tenth century, that the body of Christ was carnally present in the Sacrament, he would confess his error. His book on the Sacrament was written seven years since, and it still was unanswered. He ended by saying, that a long meditation on the words of his blessed Saviour had subdued all fears for his personal safety, and quoted this passage of Scripture: ' Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him will My Father confess before the holy Angels.' "

The Archbishop then required the Commissioners for the King and Queen to report all that he had said on the contradiction between the two oaths of maintaining the liberties of the kingdom, and the supremacy of the Pope. To the Bishop of Gloucester he made a particular appeal, accusing this Prelate of perjury, since he sat there as judge

on behalf of the Pope, though he had received his Bishopric from the King. Brookes having retorted that Cranmer had been the cause of his perjury, by persuading him to swear to the ecclesiastical supremacy of Henry the Eighth, the Archbishop triumphantly repelled the imputation. He proved before the whole assembly, and without an attempt of contradiction from Brookes, that the supremacy was conceded to Henry the Eighth by his predecessor Warham; that the question had been proposed to both Universities; that both Universities had agreed in asserting the supremacy of the King, and in denying the Pope's jurisdiction within the realm of England; and that Brookes, then a Doctor in Divinity, was among the subscribers. While the Archbishop made this reply he stood, and wore his cap.

Storey, the other Proctor, began a reply to the Archbishop, in which he shewed himself a better lawyer than a logician. Having truly said, that as Parliament had restored the Canon Law, it was now a part of the law of the realm, he moved that the prisoner should be compelled to give a categorical answer to the articles alleged against him. Some conference having taken place between Cranmer and Martin, the articles, in number sixteen, were exhibited, and to each a direct answer was given by Cranmer. A more particular examination commenced on some of the articles, particularly on the oath of obedience to the Pope, which Cranmer swore on his promotion to the Primacy, and the protestation which he made in contradiction to that oath. Cranmer said, that his protestation was made after advice with the King himself, and according to the suggestion of the most experienced civilians.

Cranmer having repeated his protestation, that by giving his answers he intended not to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, the examination was closed. The President summed up the proceedings, and Storey having moved that witnesses should be called to depose against the

prisoner's heresy, the court was adjourned to the following day. On the second session, the witnesses having been sworn, and their depositions having been received, the Archbishop was asked if he had any exceptions to make against their credibility. The Archbishop objected against all, as having all been guilty of perjury, for all had taken an oath against the authority of the Pope. But this objection having been overruled, the session and the process were closed, by reading a citation<sup>k</sup> of the Archbishop to Rome within fourscore days, to make his personal answers to the articles exhibited against him. The Archbishop said he would willingly go, with the permission of the King and Queen; but he was immediately remanded to his prison.

The proceedings against Cranmer were only part of a process inchoate in England, but to be concluded at Rome. Cardinal Puteo was the Pope's delegate, and Brookes sat as sub-delegate. But the process against Ridley and Latimer was to be commenced and concluded in England; and a commission from Cardinal Pole was directed to the Bishops of Lincoln, Gloucester, and Bristol, with full power to examine the two prisoners on their heretical opinions, to receive them into the Church on repentance, and, in case of contumacy, to deliver them to the secular power.

In pursuance of this commission, both the prisoners were cited to appear; and the Court held its Session, not in Saint Mary's Church, as in the case of Cranmer, but in the Divinity School. Ridley first appeared; and, while the commission was read by a notary, the prisoner stood uncovered, until he heard the name of Cardinal Pole read as Legate of the Pope, and then he put on his cap. The

<sup>k</sup> The citation took place on Saturday, September 7, 1555, before the commencement of the process; but it was no doubt read again in open court at its conclusion.—Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. vol. iii. Life of Cranmer, note, p. 570.

Bishop of Lincoln, offended by this conduct, reminded him, that, however the Commissioners might excuse any outward mark of disrespect towards themselves, yet, as the representatives both of the Pope and of his Legate, they could not pass over any contempt towards such high authorities. Unless, therefore, the prisoner voluntarily rendered the customary marks of respect, his cap should be taken from him.

Ridley vindicated himself from any personal disrespect towards the Commissioners, or contempt of Cardinal Pole. "The Cardinal," says Ridley, "I know to be worthy of all reverence and honour, on account of his high descent, his great learning, and many virtues. In acknowledgment of these excellent qualities,"—taking off his cap, and bowing his knee,—"I thus shew my respect; but in that he is Legate to the Bishop of Rome,"—and here he again put on his cap,—"I utterly refuse to shew him any reverence, lest, by so doing, I should commit an action contrary to my oath, and derogatory from the word of God."

This explanation was far from satisfactory to the Commissioners; and the Bishop of Lincoln admonished him a second time, to shew the usual marks of reverence towards the Pope and the Cardinal, the Pope's Legate, and told him, that, unless he consented to take off his cap, it should be taken from him, except he alleged sickness as the reason for remaining covered. The plea of sickness Ridley disdained, and repeated the reason of his refusal. "In taking my cap from me," said the undaunted Prelate, "do as it should seem fit to your Lordships, and I shall be content." After a third admonition, the Bishop of Lincoln directed one of the beadle to take off the prisoner's cap, and Ridley, gently bowing his head, patiently submitted while the officer did his duty.

The Bishop of Lincoln then proceeded to explain the design for which the Court sat, and the nature of the Commission. He and his brethren were sent to restore

two heretics to the unity of the Church. After reminding Ridley that he was once a member of the Church of Rome, he added, "It is no strange country whither I exhort you to return; you were once of us." "I was myself," observed the Bishop, "in the house of the present Lord Chancellor, unknown to you, when you came to persuade him to agree in your new doctrine of justification by faith only. The Lord Chancellor, after your departure, told me the object of your visit, and, among the other arguments, by which you attempted to persuade him, mentioned the following: You said, this matter of justification was but a trifle, and that it might be conceded; but the verity of the Sacrament you exhorted the Chancellor firmly to maintain, for you foresaw that it would be next assailed."

To this statement, before it was completely ended, Ridley obtained permission to offer an explanation. He readily acknowledged that he was once of the same way of thinking with the Romanists, concerning the corporal presence in the Eucharist; but the purport of his interview with Gardiner, the present Lord Chancellor, was either misunderstood or misrepresented. "I was sent," Ridley explained, "by the Council to my Lord of Winchester, to persuade him to receive the true doctrine of justification. Seeing his obstinacy, I pressed him with this argument, that he saw many anabaptists opposing the Sacrament of the Altar, and that his firmness might be shewn by withholding them. It was in this sense that I advised the Lord Chancellor to be firm in defence of the Sacrament, against the detestable errors of the Anabaptists, and not in defence of that gross and carnal opinion maintained by the Church of Rome."

With equal success he vindicated himself against a vulgar misconception of a sermon delivered by him at St. Paul's Cross. In that discourse he was commonly supposed to have asserted the doctrine of transubstantiation; but he clearly proved that he only inculcated the salutary doctrine,

that the Body and Blood of Christ are spiritually received in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. These words had been wrested by the unlearned into an assertion of the corporal presence<sup>1</sup>.

After the conference had been protracted to a considerable length, the Bishop of Lincoln proposed certain Articles, to which he required from the prisoner a categorical answer. The instructions of the Commissioners were to demand an affirmative or a negative, without any reasons assigned. Ridley was allowed until the next morning to give his answers, and the Articles were the same as those on which the disputation had taken place in the preceding year.

But when there had been some consultation among the Commissioners, the Bishop of Lincoln required an immediate answer to the first Article; and when Ridley objected, that this sudden demand was an infringement of their own stipulation, the Court promised that his answers should not be interpreted to his prejudice, but on the next day he might have liberty to correct them. Ridley was prepared to give his answer at once, and without consideration; but required that his protestation should be recorded against interpreting his compliance into a recognition of the papal authority; and, saving his protestation, he delivered his answers to each of the Articles. On all but the first his answers were precise; but on the first he was required to state his meaning more clearly on the following day. In the mean time, he was allowed the use of pen and ink, and such books as he wanted, if they could be procured. He was then dismissed, and consigned to the custody of the Mayor.

<sup>1</sup> It was the fate of Ridley to be injured by the calumnies of Protestants as well as Papists. Thus he was accused by Fox of having been present at the celebration of mass while a prisoner in the Tower. If his own denial of this calumny, in a letter to Bradford, be not a sufficient exculpation, the silence of the Commissioners is an irrefragable proof of its falsehood.

Latimer was then summoned ; but his examination was comparatively short. He pleaded his age and past sufferings as a reason why he ought not to be detained ; but, on being provoked to a conference, he shewed that his learning was not contemptible, though accompanied by rusticity of manner, and that his mind was unimpaired by age. With a becoming seriousness, he repressed the untimely levity of the hearers, whose mirth was excited by the vivacity and artlessness of his replies. His answers were given with a similar protestation to that of Ridley, and they were given promptly and distinctly. In vain he supplicated that he might not be summoned again ; he certainly should retain the same opinion on the next day, as he had now expressed ; and they might now dispose of him as they thought it fit.

On the following morning the Commissioners, being about to pronounce sentence, held their Session in Saint Mary's Church ; and Ridley was, as before, first introduced. Having again refused to take off his cap, as a mark of respect for the legate of the Pope, it was rudely snatched from his head by one of the beadles.

The business of the day was opened by a speech from the Bishop of Lincoln, and it was employed in a vindication of his own interpretation of a passage in Saint Augustine, against the exceptions of Ridley, offered on the preceding day. He also referred to a passage of Cyril, quoted by Melancthon ; but on inquiring for the works of Melancthon, to shew the accuracy of his quotation, it was found that they had been lately burnt.

After a long and unprofitable discussion, the Bishop of Lincoln observed, that the Commissioners had already exceeded their instructions, and that they must now require categorical answers to the Articles. The written answer of Ridley to the first Article being required, the prisoner began to read it ; but the Bishop commanded it to be taken away. Ridley having remonstrated against

this unfair treatment, the Bishop said, that, on looking at the paper, he found it to contain words of blasphemy, and therefore it was unfit to be read to the audience. Some garbled extracts were read, notwithstanding the indignant expostulations of Ridley, and then the answers to the Articles were recorded by the notaries, as being the same which he had maintained in the disputation of the preceding year.

The answers having been recorded, Brookes, whose learning and eloquence were acknowledged even by those who differed from him, and by none more warmly than Ridley himself, endeavoured to bring this invincible champion of the Protestant faith to a recantation. The following passage in his address is a proof of the high estimation of Ridley, even among the Romanists: “Latimer leaneth to Cranmer, Cranmer to Ridley, and Ridley to the singularity of his own wit; so that, if you overthrow the singularity of Ridley’s wit, then must needs the religion of Cranmer and Ridley fall also.” To this eulogy Ridley modestly replied, that he was but a young scholar in comparison of the Archbishop, who, in learning, and in every other respect, was qualified to be his instructor.

The Bishop of Lincoln seconded the persuasions of the Bishop of Gloucester; but finding that persuasions were unavailing, the sentence of the greater excommunication was read. Ridley was condemned as an obstinate heretic, adjudged to be degraded from all ecclesiastical orders, and then to be delivered over for extreme punishment to the secular power.

Immediately after Ridley was dismissed, Latimer appeared before the Court for the last time. He repeated his protestation, that, by giving his answers, he intended no acknowledgment of the Pope’s authority. After his sentence of excommunication had been read, he earnestly desired that his reasons might be heard why he refused to submit to the Pope’s authority; but this liberty was denied.

He then appealed to the next General Council which should be called in God's name; but the Bishop of Lincoln told him, that a long time would elapse before such a Council would be called.

Previously to the execution of the sentence, the ceremony of degradation was performed. The offer of mercy was again tendered to both, and there is no doubt that it was made in sincerity. The learning of Ridley and the popularity of Latimer would have rendered their conversion a cause of triumph.

Nothing now remained but the last trying scene; and each of the martyrs prepared himself for his approaching death, which “a sound judgment, and a good conscience, made him look upon as a matter of joy and triumph<sup>m</sup>. ” The place appointed for the horrid spectacle was a ditch, without the wall of Balliol College; and it is said, that the spot was chosen by the Bishop of Gloucester, who had been formerly its Master. The two sufferers exhibited a striking contrast in their appearance, Ridley being attired in his episcopal robe, and Latimer in his prison cloak; the one shewing what they had once been, the other to what they were now reduced<sup>n</sup>.

As Ridley passed the prison where Cranmer was confined, he looked up, hoping to see him at the window, and to receive the last farewell of his patron and friend; but the Archbishop was engaged in a disputation with a Spanish Friar. Yet the two Martyrs had the benefit of his prayers, though not the consolation of his valediction: he saw the appalling sight from the tower of his prison, and on his knees prayed that the Divine strength might not fail them in their last agonies.

Next to the prospect of the glorious reward which awaited them hereafter, their greatest consolation was, that they should not die in vain; that they should light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as should never be

<sup>m</sup> Ridley's Life of Bishop Ridley, p. 662.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid.

put out. Their consolation was not groundless, their prediction has been amply verified; posterity has derived from their example those pure and charitable feelings which they so conspicuously displayed; and it is only just to add, that their devotion to the cause of God, and their contempt of all sublunary considerations, effected even in some of the spectators an entire change of opinion.

A memorable instance of this conversion occurs in the case of Julius Palmer, a Fellow of Magdalen College, who had been a warm and zealous papist throughout the reign of Edward, had been deprived of his Fellowship, and had been expelled his College for nonconformity. In the reign of Mary, he had been restored, and had shewn increased bitterness towards the Reformers. Although he was surprised that they had so patiently submitted to the loss of their preferments, yet he doubted not what Gardiner had declared, that severity would reclaim them. He therefore voluntarily proposed their constancy in death as the test both of the sincerity and the soundness of their faith. For this purpose he sent some of his pupils to Gloucester, that they might observe and report to him the manner in which Hooper met death; yet still he persuaded himself that the fortitude of Hooper was exaggerated, or that it originated in fanaticism. At Oxford, however, he was an anxious spectator, and a vigilant observer: he had witnessed the examination of the Protestant Prelates; he had heard their answers, and seen the magnanimity with which they disdained the offers of life, rather than deny their faith; and he finally saw how cheerfully they yielded up their lives in testimony of the truths which they believed. Palmer retired from the awful scene a convert, and departed, exclaiming publicly against the tyranny and cruelty of the papists; and, having suffered loss of fortune for his adherence to Popery under King Edward, he suffered loss of life for Protestantism under Queen Mary<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. p. 670.

Yet there was an instance of a contrary kind, in which the intense and protracted torments of Ridley gave occasion to the bitter and malicious insinuation, that he wanted the spirit of a martyr. A bigoted papist, one Dorman, of some subsequent notoriety, who, like Palmer, was a spectator of the transaction, spoke in disparagement of Ridley's courage, because he accepted some gunpowder to shorten the duration of his pains. But he was properly reminded by Nowell in his answer, that Ignatius provoked the fury of the wild beasts, in order that they might more speedily tear him in pieces; and when Polycarp was committed to the flames, his persecutors ended his torments by piercing him with a sword.<sup>p</sup>

The death of Ridley and Latimer was quickly followed by that of Gardiner; so quickly followed, that the two events have been thought to be connected by a special interposition of Providence<sup>q</sup>. He opened the Session of Parliament, which met within a few days after the death of the Protestant Prelates; and he appeared a second time

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. p. 671.

<sup>q</sup> "Foxe," says Collier, "tells a story which he pretends to have from credible intelligence, that, on the day when Ridley and Latimer were burnt, Gardiner invited the old Duke of Norfolk to dine with him, and that he deferred the dinner till he received intelligence that the fire was kindled. On hearing the news, he went to dinner, but was seized with a sudden illness, from which he never recovered." Collier observes truly, that the old Duke of Norfolk died in September, 1554, almost a year before this event. However Fox might give credit to the story, yet no reader of Fox, even from his own relation, can think it credible. He tells it thus: "Notwithstanding here by the way, touching the death of this foresayd B. though not to ouerpass a *certaine hearesay*, which not long since came to me by information of *a certaine worthy and credible Gentlewoman*, and an other Gentleman of the same name and kindred; which *Mistres Monday*, being the *wyfe of one M. Monday, secretary sometime to the old L. Thomas, D. of Northfolke, a present witnes of this that is testified, thus openly reported in the house of a worshypfull citisen, bearyng yet office in this citie.*" This is the authority on which Fox relied. *Acts and Mon.* vol. ii. p. 1787. fol. ed. Lond. 1583.

in that assembly; but, with these two exceptions, he never appeared again in public. The witnesses of his death-bed have described it as disturbed by the remembrance of his past life. Frequently was he heard to exclaim, "I have erred with Peter, but I have not wept with Peter." When Day, the Bishop of Chichester, endeavoured to comfort him with the assurance of justification through the blood of Christ, he replied, that such a doctrine might be useful to him, and to others in his condition, but if it were preached to the people, then "farewell altogether!"

While Gardiner lived, he was at the head of a party both in the Church and in the State. As a Statesman, he was able in forming his plans, and dexterous in their execution. As a Churchman, his theological learning was moderate; but his skill in the canon law exceeded that of most Divines. While he assented to the doctrines of the Romish Church, he was not the slave of papal supremacy; and, even after the jurisdiction of the Pope was recognised, he insisted that the papal Legate should not put in use any Bull from Rome without a licence under the Great Seal. He also contended, that, although the Statutes of Edward the Third and Henry the Eighth were repealed, the more ancient laws against 'provisors' were still in force.

On the death of Gardiner, the Chancellorship was conferred on Heath, Archbishop of York, and the administration of the Church was resigned entirely to Cardinal Pole. Before the death of Gardiner, Pole had obtained licence to hold a Synod, and to make Canons; and to this Synod he submitted a book well known by the title of "The Reformation of England." This book is an imperishable monument of his honest intentions, as well as of his practical wisdom, and it bears evidence of his further designs for the promotion of piety. In consequence of the dearth of preachers, he intended to publish a col-

lection of Homilies, divided into four books : the first, on the controverted points, for preserving the people from error ; the second, containing an exposition of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the salutation of the Virgin, and the Sacraments ; the third, an explanation of the Epistles and Gospels ; and the fourth, concerning Virtues and Vices, and the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

From the moderation of Heath, and the liberality of Pole, it was inferred, not unreasonably, that the persecution of the Reformers would be remitted ; but the inference proved to be erroneous. Philpot was the next sufferer of celebrity : he pleaded that he had neither spoken nor written against the new laws ; for since their enactment, he had suffered a close imprisonment. But in one of the conferences with Boner, that Prelate informed him, that the death of Gardiner would make no alteration in the condition of heretics, and that recantation or death was still the alternative.

The time now approached, when Pole was to possess that station for which his Sovereign had long since designed him. It has been said, that Gardiner never relinquished his hopes of obtaining the Primacy ; and that he had endeavoured to preserve Cranmer until some crisis might arrive when Pole would be no longer an impediment to his aspiring views. Whatever might have been the secret wishes of Gardiner, it is certain that Cranmer was not spared on this account. Before the death of Gardiner, the process against Cranmer was begun, of which the proceedings in Oxford were a part ; and if Gardiner had survived its completion, it would have terminated in the same manner. There is still less truth in the insinuation, that the death of Cranmer was instigated or hastened by Pole, from a desire of being placed in the see of Canterbury ; for the see was actually void by the attainder of Cranmer two years before. The death of Cranmer was an act of

gratuitous cruelty, meditated and executed by the Queen, and her guilt will not be lessened because she had accomplices. She pardoned his treason, that she might punish his heresy.

When the eighty days were expired which the citation had allowed for the appearance of Cranmer at Rome, Cardinal Puteo moved in Consistory his accusations against the Archbishop of Canterbury; in consequence of which, in a subsequent Session of the Court, he was sentenced to be excommunicated and deprived; and at a third Session, the administration of the see thus vacated was conferred on Cardinal Pole.

As soon as the definitive sentence was received in England, Cranmer was cited before certain Commissioners, of whom the chief were Boner, Bishop of London, and Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, who were invested with full powers to degrade him, and then to deliver him to the secular power. The place chosen for the execution of the definitive sentence was the choir of the Cathedral of Christ Church in Oxford. When Cranmer was brought before the Court, the Commission was read, stating that Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterbury, had been cited to appear at Rome; that he had wilfully disobeyed the citation; that Articles had been exhibited; that evidence had been heard and examined; that he had wanted nothing appertaining to his necessary defence; and that, in consequence of his refusal to appear, he had been pronounced contumacious<sup>q</sup>. On hearing this statement read, Cranmer could not forbear to exclaim, “God must needs punish such open and shameless lying, that I, being in prison, and not suffered even at home to have counsel or advocate, should produce witnesses and appoint my counsel at Rome!”

When the Commission had been read, the Court pro-

<sup>q</sup> Heylin's Hist. Ref. p. 225.

ceeded to his degradation. He was clothed in the robes of an Archbishop, with the distinguishing appendage of the pall, but the robes were of canvas: a mitre was placed on his head, and a crosier in his hand. Boner and Thirlby then performed the ceremony of degradation; the one with the most bitter invectives and savage exultation, the other with expressions of heartfelt sorrow. When they attempted to take the crosier from his hand, he held it fast, and refused to deliver it; and, imitating the example of Martin Luther<sup>r</sup>, he pulled from under his sleeve a paper, which he presented to the Commissioners, saying at the same time, "I appeal to the next General Council; and herein I have comprehended my cause and form of it; which appeal I desire may be admitted." The appeal being handed to the Commissioners, the Bishop of Ely said, that their Commission precluded all appeal, and therefore none could be admitted. "Then," replied Cranmer, "you do me the more wrong; for my case is not a common case: the matter is between the Pope and me immediately, and none other, and no man ought to be a judge in his own cause." The Bishop of Ely then received the appeal, and promised that it should be admitted if possible. When they came to take off his pall, he said, "Which of you hath a pall, to take off mine?" One of them answered, that, in respect of their being only Bishops, they were his inferiors, and therefore not competent to degrade him; but as they were the delegates of the Pope, they had an authority above that of a metropolitan.

After this pageant of degradation, Cranmer was clothed in a squalid garb, and consigned to the common prison, there to remain till the secular power executed the sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court. Yet, before the tragical cata-

<sup>r</sup> Foxe's *Acts and Mon.* vol. iii. p. 556. Luther first appealed from Cardinal Cajetan, the Pope's delegate, to the Pope himself, and afterwards from the Pope to a General Council.

strophe, he was appointed to sustain a trial more severe than any which he had yet encountered ; for it was a trial under which he fell.

This portion of Cranmer's life is involved in obscurity, the elucidation of which is impossible; an obscurity, the cause of which must be attributed to the wilful misrepresentation, or the credulous statement, of prejudiced historians. The common account, though not without its difficulties, is, after all, the most probable, that immediately after the degradation of Cranmer, the popish priesthood was busily employed in persuading him to a recantation, and that he was removed from his prison to the deanery of Christ Church, where he experienced the most humane and tender treatment. Henry Sydal, and John de Garcina, a Spanish friar, were employed, first to argue with him, and, if arguments were unsuccessful, to try his constancy with offers of mercy and favour. He was flattered with the representation that his conversion would be peculiarly acceptable to the King, the Queen, and the whole nation; that he might, if he pleased, be restored to his former dignity, or might pass the remainder of his life in a private station. He was terrified by the certain prospect of an excruciating death, which it was impossible to avert, unless by renouncing his heresies, and returning to the unity of the Church. How long Cranmer resisted their solicitations is unknown, but it is certain that he finally yielded.

Cranmer was prevailed on to sign more than a single recantation; for after he had himself written one paper, so dexterously worded as to be capable of an ambiguous interpretation, a second was required in explanation of the first. He was at last brought to sign six different recantations, the last of which was very prolix, and contained not only an acknowledgment of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, which he had opposed throughout

his life, but a confession of his own blasphemous and profane conduct.

No sooner were these recantations signed, than they were published by Boner with malicious eagerness and joy. Whether the popish priests were authorized by the Queen to procure a recantation from Cranmer; and still more, whether they were authorized to flatter him with false hopes of mercy, are questions which have been debated, but to the determination of which no one can come without a bias. Leaving them undecided, it is sufficient to state, that whatever gratification the Queen might have derived from his compliance, she was not moved from her purpose of sacrificing him to her resentment. As he had been the great promoter of heresy, and had corrupted the whole nation, she thought it right that he should suffer. His conversion from his heresies might be good for his own soul, and might be of service to others, but it ought not to save him from his merited punishment. After having fixed the day for his execution, she herself directed Cole, the Provost of Eton, to preach a sermon on the occasion.

Cole, having received his instructions, repaired to Oxford, and the day before the execution visited Cranmer in his prison, to interrogate him whether he still continued steadfast in the Catholic faith? Cranmer replied, that he trusted by God's grace to be daily more and more confirmed in that faith. On the morning of the execution, Cole again visited him, to inquire whether he had any money? finding that he had none, Cole gave him fifteen crowns to distribute to the poor.

No direct information was given to Cranmer that he was about to suffer; but these circumstances excited his suspicions, and they were confirmed by the visit of John de Garcina. The Spanish Friar brought some written articles, which he desired Cranmer to sign, and to repeat before the

people. To this request Cranmer acceded, but secretly deposited in his bosom another paper, containing a prayer, an exhortation, and a confession of faith, “such as flowed from his conscience, and not from his fears.”

He was conducted with great ceremony to St. Mary’s Church, and placed on a stage opposite the pulpit, that he might be seen by the whole audience. Cole ascended the pulpit, and began his sermon, which he divided into three parts; intending to speak of the mercy of God; secondly, of the justice of God; and, thirdly, of the counsels of Princes, which are not to be revealed. Having descanted on the Divine justice, and the Divine mercy, attributes which are not contradictory, but which are frequently displayed at the same time; the preacher, under the third head of his discourse, applied himself to Cranmer. The union of mercy and justice was visible in the punishment about to be inflicted: there were many obvious reasons for this appointment, and there were some just and weighty causes which weighed with the Queen and Council, but which it was not fit to reveal. He therefore exhorted Cranmer to constancy under his sufferings; arming him against the terror of death by the assurance, that God would either abate the fury of the flame, or give him strength to abide it. Cranmer’s conversion had been the immediate work of God, and to God alone ought glory to be given: in it were exhibited striking marks of justice and mercy: while he abounded in riches and honours he was unworthy to live, and now that he was no longer permitted to live, he was unworthy to die. But a strong hope was given to him of obtaining eternal life, and he might be assured that masses for the repose of his soul should be said in all the Churches of Oxford.

During the delivery of this sermon, Cranmer expressed the greatest emotion, sometimes lifting his eyes to heaven, and sometimes fixing them on the ground. When the

<sup>s</sup> Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 670.

sermon was ended, and the people were about to depart, Cole called them back, first to prayer, and then to hear a confession from the lips of the dying penitent.

Cranmer rising and taking off his cap, began his address to the people. He first read his prayer, being a supplication for mercy, and support in his approaching trial. He then ‘admonished the hearers not to set their affections on the things of this world ; to obey the King and Queen from conscience towards God ; to live in mutual love and charity. He then came,’ as he said, ‘to the conclusion of his life, on which depended all his past life, as well as that which was to come, being now either to enter into the joys of heaven, or to suffer the pains of hell. The present was no time for dissimulation, and he was therefore now about to make a true declaration of his faith. Having repeated the Apostles’ Creed, and professed his belief in the holy Scriptures, he came to a point which, he said, pressed on his conscience more than any other action of his whole life, and this was his subscription to a declaration contrary to truth. It was made through fear of death, and with the hope of saving his life ; but it was contrary to the thought of his heart. Now, therefore, when he was about to die, he utterly renounced “all such bills and papers” as he had written or signed since his degradation, and because his hand had offended by writing contrary to his heart, that hand should be signally punished, for when he came to the fire it should be first burned. The Pope he rejected as Antichrist, with all the false doctrines of Popery ; and as to the Sacrament, he retained the same belief as he had when he wrote his book against the Bishop of Winchester. The true doctrine would stand at the last day before the judgment of God, where the papistical doctrine contrary to it would be ashamed to shew its face.’

When the audience heard this unexpected declaration, a general confusion took place : some began to charge him with his recantation, and to accuse him of falsehood, and

admonished him to dissemble no longer. He replied, that he had ever loved simplicity, and throughout his life had hated dissimulation. He would have gone on in his discourse, but was prevented by an universal clamour, and Cole exclaimed, "Stop the mouth of the heretic, and take him away!" He was then dragged from the stage on which he was elevated, and was led to the same spot where Ridley and Latimer had not long before resigned their lives. All the way from the Church to the place of execution, the Friars continued to utter the severest reproaches, and the most dreadful threats of eternal vengeance<sup>t</sup>.

The venerable Primate, serene and inflexible, maintained that fortitude at the stake which he had resumed in the Church, and closed his life with an action which has no parallel in Christian martyrology, and which Voltaire has panegyrized as being more intrepid and magnanimous than a similar action of Mutius Scævola. Stretching forth his right hand into the fire, he never moved it, save once that he passed it across his face, till it was entirely consumed, and before the fire had reached his body, it was reduced to ashes. "That unworthy hand!" was his frequent ejaculation during his agony. This act of heroism is so strongly attested, that it has never been controverted by the most virulent enemies of the Reformation. That Cranmer voluntarily and with calm deliberation burnt his hand, is a fact which every member of the Church of England rejoices to find so uncontestedly established; whether his heart was found unconsumed among the ashes is a question which he contentedly leaves in doubt, as being more congenial to the legends of the Church of Rome.

If Cranmer, after his recantation, had been consigned to perpetual imprisonment, or irrevocable exile; or, to carry the supposition farther, if he had been reinstated in his high dignity, the creature and slave of the Pope; the

<sup>t</sup> *Acts and Mon.* vol. iii. p. 562.

enemies of the Reformation might have loaded it with fresh calumny. His constitutional timidity, increased by affliction and age, might have prevailed over the candour and sincerity of his temper, and to the end of his life he might have continued in outward communion with the Romish Church. But malice and cruelty defeated their own purposes, and though his enemies meant it not, “neither did their heart think so,” he rendered, by the manner of his death, a substantial and lasting benefit to the Protestant faith, and effectually vindicated his personal integrity.

At this period the Church of England must be considered as no longer independent, but as a branch of the Church of Rome, and therefore its history during the remainder of Mary’s reign may be soon told. On the day after the execution of Cranmer, Pole was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, and two days after was invested with the pall by the Bishops of Ely and Worcester. His ecclesiastical administration will most conveniently include all the events deserving of notice by the historian.

Various have been the representations of his conduct; but it is not candid or just to confound errors in government with vices of personal character. The memory of Pole is to be jealously guarded from any prejudiced insinuation; it is deservedly dear to every Englishman, and far be it from any Protestant to detract from the merit of one, whom his own Church has almost repudiated, on account of his catholic charity.

The persecution of the Protestants after the death  
<sup>1557</sup> of Gardiner has been unjustly imputed to Pole\*, and with less colour of probability than, during his life, to Gardiner himself. Both these Prelates were instruments under the direction of the Queen; Gardiner a willing, and

[\* See Massingberd, p. 423. and Nos. 96, 98, and 102. of Brit. Crit. by Archdeacon Churton, shewing the large share Philip had in the Marian persecution.]

Pole not a passive, but a reluctant instrument. However he might lament, yet he could not alter, the severity of her temper; and, looking at his situation, it will be seen, that, instead of possessing any control over the Court of England, he depended solely on the countenance and protection of his Sovereign for security against the Court of Rome.

When Pole accepted the English legation, he enjoyed the friendship of the reigning Pontiff, and great influence in the sacred College; but on the accession of Paul the Fourth [in 1555], his situation was changed. The Cardinal having interfered in the adjustment of the differences between France and Spain, and having ventured to suggest the propriety of the Pope's mediation, his legatine commission was revoked, and William Peyto, an English Franciscan, was substituted in his place. Nothing but the partiality of the Queen could have prevented him from being cited before the Inquisition at Rome; but Mary commanded the ports to be guarded, and prohibited the papal messenger from landing on the English shore. In a letter of remonstrance she boldly informed the Pontiff, that if Pole were deprived of his legation, no other should enjoy that distinction, and that the legatine powers vested in the see of Canterbury were confirmed by the English laws, and fortified by the English constitution<sup>x</sup>.

Justice, therefore, demands, that the spontaneous and unbiassed actions of Pole should be separated from those in which he unwillingly concurred; and the encomium of an historian, penurious of praise to any member of the Church of Rome, ought not to be suppressed: "He had such qualities and such a temper, that if he could have brought the other Bishops to follow his measures, he might have probably done much towards reducing the nation to Popery<sup>y</sup>."

The Queen shewed her devotion to the Church of Rome

<sup>x</sup> Beccatell. Vit. Reg. Poli. Lond. 1690. p. 73.

<sup>y</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 742.

in the creation of religious houses, and the re-establishment of monastic orders. For the 'Franciscans of the observance' she had an hereditary affection; she rebuilt the monastery at Greenwich, and restored as many of the old fraternity as could be done. Their rivals, the Dominicans, were stationed at Smithfield; the military order of the Hospitallers was revived, and Sir Thomas Gresham, as Grand Prior, resumed his place in the Upper House of Parliament.

Another religious order, which had its institution after the Reformation, which was long the support of the declining papacy, and which gained a dictatorial power in the monastic republic, was prevented from gaining a settlement in England by the firm resistance of Pole. The order of Jesuits had been founded in the latter part of Henry's reign, but from a monarch who had dissolved all the religious orders within his dominions, these papal janissaries could expect no favour. It was suggested to Pole, that the restoration of the old orders would be of little use, in comparison of establishing the Jesuits, who, in activity, exceeded the Dominicans; who, in their notions of free will, agreed with the Franciscans; and who, so far from professing mendicity, were ready to take possession of the property of the Benedictines. Pole refused to listen to the specious proposition, and his memory has, on that account, been loaded with jesuitical obloquy.

With the power of gratifying her religious prejudices, and with the restoration of the Romish religion, Mary was still a stranger to tranquillity. Her disappointment in the hope of issue, and the consequent coldness and final desertion of Philip, exasperated a temper naturally gloomy. The loss of Calais, and other national reverses, brought on an early dissolution; and her death conferred on Elizabeth the power and the honour of reversing her religious policy.

The health of Pole had long been feeble, but his end

was probably hastened by the death of Mary; for he survived it only sixteen hours. When he despaired of her recovery, and had little prospect of his own, he sent a letter to the Princess Elizabeth, by Holland, Dean of Worcester, his Chaplain. Its object was to satisfy the Princess that he had not participated in the ungenerous treatment which she had experienced, and perhaps to recommend her continuance in the unity of the Catholic Church<sup>z</sup>.

At the conclusion of his life, his love of retirement, if possible, was increased, and he was completely alienated from his family and English connexions. The munificence of his temper prevented him from amassing wealth, and the small portion which he possessed was bequeathed to Priuli, a noble Venetian, who lived under his roof, and who had for many years shared his fortunes. The legatee was worthy of the testator: Priuli, having paid the debts of his departed friend, distributed the residue in charity, reserving to himself nothing of the property of Pole but the breviary and the diary <sup>a</sup>.

## CHAPTER XIV.

Of the exiled Church of England.—Number of the Exiles.—Characters of the principal Divines.—Poinet.—Coverdale.—Cox.—Jewel.—Troubles at Frankfort.—Knoxians and Coxians.—Intelligence of the Death of Mary.—Return of the Exiles at the Accession of Elizabeth.

A CHURCH, like a “nation, is a moral essence, not a geographical arrangement, or a denomination of the nomenclator<sup>b</sup>:” its locality, therefore, will be changed with

<sup>z</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. Appendix, No. lxxv.

<sup>a</sup> Ex quibus Polus Deum precari solitus erat, Breviarium vocamus et Diurnale. Beccatell. Vit. Reg. Poli.

<sup>b</sup> Burke's First Letter on a Regicide Peace, p. 191. Lond. 1815.

that of the individuals who compose it. In the reign of Mary, the Protestant English Church was not to be found in England ; it was to be found, where the historian must now follow it, among its dispersed members, whom the bigotry of the Romish Church forced into exile. Under any circumstances these persecuted men would deserve a grateful remembrance : had they all died in a foreign land, patriotism and piety alike forbid that their memory should perish. But these exiles were appointed to a higher destination : they returned, to modify, though not to determine, the future state of the English Church. Unhappily, also, the first schism in that Church began in its exiled and persecuted condition, and, still more unhappily, the schism was widened when persecution ceased. Those who had fomented religious division in banishment, brought back to their own country the jealousies which they should have left behind them ; and, the seeds of discord being sown in an English soil, acquired strength and luxuriance.

The character of a religious exile is peculiarly open to temptation ; for the qualities of which it is composed are doubtful and heterogeneous : it possesses not enough of firmness to await the shock of persecution, and too much of integrity to submit to a compromise or concealment of opinion. The martyr's crown, though it be a crown of thorns, is an irradiated crown ; he expires in the midst of "a cloud of witnesses," whose sympathy animates his resolution, and whose bitterness only excites his charity. The sufferings of the exile are, for the most part, unseen ; and, instead of exciting pious resignation in himself, and brotherly-kindness towards others, too frequently engender overweening pride and confirmed misanthropy.

With these preliminary observations, the reader is prepared to peruse a chequered narrative, in which he will find many events which inculcate humility, and many which inspire caution.

At the commencement of Mary's reign, a proclamation from the Queen announced to all her subjects liberty of conscience; but there was no literal infringement of the promise, nor any violation of candour in not extending this liberty to foreigners. The refugees, who had settled in England in reliance on the national faith, and under an express promise of protection, were commanded to depart. Peter Martyr was a functionary in an English University; and therefore a debate arose, whether, since he enjoyed the privileges of an English subject, he was not liable to the same restraints; and a consultation took place, whether, instead of being allowed to depart, he should not be committed to prison. But Gardiner interposed to save the national honour, and it was at length resolved, that Martyr should have a licence to quit the kingdom. The foreign divine maintained the same independence of spirit in adverse circumstances as when in the possession of an honourable competence, accompanied with academical authority. He said, that he had come into England on an invitation from the Government, and for the purpose of filling an accredited station, and therefore he refused to leave the country without a public passport. Having obtained it, he took his passage to Antwerp, whence he immediately proceeded to Strasburg.

An order was sent to John Alasco and his congregation to leave the kingdom; their Church of the Gray Friars was taken from them, and the corporation dissolved. They all obeyed the order, except a few merchants and two of their preachers, and the remainder attempted to settle in Denmark; but, on account of their adherence to the Helvetian Confession, were refused protection. After enduring many hardships, they were at last suffered to gain a settlement in Friesland. The Church at Glastonbury was also broken up, and most of its members removed to Frankfort, where they were enabled to repay to the English exiles that kindness which they had experienced.

The measure of dissolving the foreign Churches, and of commanding their congregations to leave the country, was thought by the English Protestants to be a harbinger of their own approaching persecution, and was regarded as a signal, warning them to fly. At first they were enabled to escape in the company, or as the domestics, of foreigners, and particularly of the French Protestants; but the Council, understanding the prevalence of such an unjustifiable evasion, issued an order, that no Frenchman should be suffered to embark, without a certificate from the French ambassador.

Escape was now rendered difficult, and was frequently effected with extreme danger, though in a few instances an express permission was given to earnest solicitation, when seconded by the recommendation of persons in power. By these different expedients, a large body of Protestants was enabled to exchange the imminent terrors of imprisonment and death for the contingent and unknown evils of banishment.

The number of English exiles has been still more variously stated than the number of those who suffered death at home. While some accounts have reduced it to three hundred, others have raised it to more than a thousand. The last computation approaches nearest the truth; for, according to authentic documents, three hundred English exiles were settled at Frankfort.

In order that the transactions of the exiled Church may be comprehended more distinctly, it will be necessary to give a previous description of its most prominent characters, some of whom had already gained celebrity in promoting the Reformation at home, while others acquired their early reputation in the English congregations at Frankfort, Strasburg, and Zurich.

Not only because he possessed the highest station, but because an active and ardent mind incited him to render the influence of high station instrumental in the promotion

of the Protestant faith, is the precedence due to Poinet, the late Bishop of Winchester. If he had resolved to remain, he must have resolved to suffer with his episcopal brethren; but as soon as he saw the approaching storm, he went into concealment, and then into exile. The time of his leaving England is not a matter which may be contentedly left in vague uncertainty, for it is connected with an interesting circumstance of his life. An historian who lived near the time<sup>b</sup>, and who cannot be accused of credulity or prejudice, has stated, that Poinet was deeply involved in Wyat's rebellion. He not only encouraged the rebellion, but joined the army, until he perceived the incapacity of its leader, when he advised some of the subordinate agents to consult their own safety, and, taking leave of his friends, with a promise to pray for their success, embarked for Germany.

To combat so positive a statement by any contrary evidence is impossible; but by an historian who has justly considered it as injurious to the memory of Poinet, a presumption has been offered, which invalidates its probability. If the accusation had any colour, still more, if it were undeniable, Gardiner, who seized every occasion to calumniate as well as to injure Poinet, would not have failed to attaint him of high treason in the succeeding Session of Parliament<sup>c</sup>.

Whether Poinet were an actor in Wyat's rebellion is uncertain, but it is beyond doubt that he justified the principle of the lawfulness of resistance to unlawful commands, and applied the principle to justify resistance against the government of Mary. In a treatise<sup>d</sup>, which was industriously circulated and eagerly read, he makes

<sup>b</sup> Stowe's Annals, p. 620. Lond. 1631.

<sup>c</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. ii. p. 543. ‘Collier rejects the report:’ see Maitland's Ess. v. p. 93.

<sup>d</sup> Entitled, “A Short Treatise on the Politic Power, with an Exhortation to all True Natural Englishmen.”

civil government to depend on the will of the people, and cites the Spartan Ephori and the Roman tribunes as a precedent for calling princes to account for their mal-administration. He presses the expedient of deposing princes, and appeals to Scripture in vindication of his doctrine. Hence it may be seen, that the doctrine of resistance as well as the doctrine of non-resistance was inculcated by Protestant divines, and both were taught in opposition to the Papists. Cranmer and Latimer held the former, Poinet strenuously maintained the latter, but all with a view of counteracting the progress of papal dominion. Thus it is that men adopt speculative principles on civil government, apparently incompatible with their religious tenets, and change both with equal inconsistency. The Protestants inculcated resistance in the reign of Mary, and the Papists in the reign of Elizabeth.

Of Poinet little more is recorded, for death soon terminated his labours and his misfortunes. He died at Strasburg before he had attained the age of forty, and was buried there with the general lamentation of his countrymen<sup>e</sup>.

Three other English Prelates, Barlow, Bishop of Bath and Wells<sup>f</sup>; Scory, Bishop of Chichester; and Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, with Bale, Bishop of Ossory, complete the catalogue of the exiled episcopacy. Of the two former Prelates much cannot be said in commendation; Scory was deprived for being married, but he appeared before Boner, renounced his marriage, submitted to penance, and received a formal absolution; and on giving this full satisfaction was restored to the limited exercise of his function. But it soon appeared that his submission was dictated by his fears, for he would not avail himself of the favour which his pusillanimous compliance had purchased, and he retired into exile. Coverdale, though a native of England, and educated at Cambridge, had resided abroad

<sup>e</sup> Godwin de Præsulibus, p. 248.

<sup>f</sup> Maitland, Ess. xx. p. 482.

the greater part of his life, and in conjunction with Tindal and Rogers had translated the Bible. Returning to England under Edward, he was made Bishop of Exeter, and in this station was a model of primitive episcopacy. His house was a little church, in which was exercised all virtue and godliness<sup>s</sup>. His avowed enmity to "all superstition and popery" had rendered him a conspicuous object of persecution: he was deprived of liberty, and his life was in danger; but he was rescued by the mediation of the King of Denmark. There he had resided in the reign of Henry the Eighth, in the highest estimation with the Danish Court, and there he again found an honourable asylum throughout the reign of Mary.

Next to the exiled Prelacy must be noticed the inferior dignitaries and divines, of whom there was a large body. Cox, the Dean of Christ Church, in Oxford, because he had superintended the education of Edward, was among the first sufferers, and, without any assignable reason, was dispossessed of his preferments, and committed to prison. His imprisonment, however, was not of long continuance, and on his release he obtained a licence to leave the country. His reputation in the University, during the reign of Edward, was equalled by his influence at Court; but academical friendship survived the loss of political connexion. Peter Martyr had lived in Christ Church under his government, and the exiled Dean fixed his residence at Strasburg, where he once more associated with his ancient friend.

Sandys, when Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, had been compelled by Northumberland to preach a Sermon in defence of the title of Lady Jane Grey; and though he executed the ungrateful task with great caution and address, yet a fine and imprisonment were imposed on him before he was permitted to leave the country. Horn, the Dean of Durham, soon after his escape, thought it fit to publish

<sup>s</sup> Brook's Lives of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 124.

an apology for quitting the kingdom. He had been advertised that offences against the State were charged against him, and he was on his journey to London to clear himself of the imputation; but seeing that he should not be allowed to make a fair defence, he purposely withdrew himself.

If the names of Grindal, Alexander Nowell, John Knox, Whittingham, Reynolds, Haddon, and Aylmer, among the exiled divines, be recited without comment, it is only because their characters will be developed in the future narrative. Yet there is one divine who must be introduced in this place, because neither age nor station, but transcendent abilities, gained him the influence which he possessed in the exiled Church. The talents and acquirements of Jewel were of such excellence, that they could not be controlled by the adventitious circumstances of fortune; and they could be only valued in an age of intellectual ardour. Dedicated to learning from his childhood, he had scarcely passed its limits, (for he was then only thirteen years of age,) when he was sent to the  
1535 University of Oxford, at a period when 'new studies of literature, and new tenets of religion, found employment for all who were desirous of truth or ambitious of fame<sup>b</sup>.' Under the tuition of Parkhurst, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, he prosecuted his studies with an eagerness and perseverance which are scarcely credible; and the severe mental application which animated him as a student, was not remitted when he became an instructor of youth.

Having been removed from Merton into Corpus Christi College, he was chosen Reader of Rhetoric and Humanity, and he filled the place seven years with the highest reputation. His example taught more than his lectures; he was not only an admirer but an imitator of Horace and Tully among the writers of the Augustan age, and of Erasmus among the moderns. Latin or English com-

<sup>b</sup> Johnson's Life of Ascham, Lond. p. ii.

position was his daily exercise, for it was with him a favourite maxim, that learning is more easily acquired by a frequent employment of the pen than by reading many books. To the study of oratory he added its practice, accustoming himself to declaim in the neighbouring woods and groves of Oxford<sup>i</sup>.

Polite literature, though cultivated by Jewel with fondness, was far from absorbing his attention; he was soon initiated into the controversies between the Romanists and the Reformers, and there is no derogation from the truth of the reformed doctrines in saying that he adopted them from early prepossession rather than from mature judgment<sup>k</sup>. But as his years advanced, his prejudices were strengthened into rational conviction. When Peter Martyr was appointed to fill the theological chair at Oxford, 1548 Jewel became one of the most constant attendants on the Lectures of that Professor. His skill in stenography, which at that time was not a mechanical art, but an accomplishment generally associated with high intellectual attainments, enabled him to appropriate the public lectures of Martyr, and at the famous disputation on the Corporal Presence, Jewel was selected by Martyr to take 1549 down in writing the arguments of the respective disputants.

<sup>i</sup> Fertur æstate in sylvam Shotoverianam Oxoniæ proximam, aut in alium aliquem secessum proficisci consueuisse, ibique in solitudine quasi in theatro declamitasse, auditores candidissimos oratione Græcâ, Latinâ, suâ, alienâ, Ciceronianâ, Demosthenicâ compellasse; gestum, pronuntiationem, vocem, vultum, omnia ad gravitatem et decorum attemperasse, ut non Juellum sed alterum Demosthenem in antro rhetoricanem, et literam caninam sonare conantem fuisse affirmares. Humphrey's Life of Jewel, Lond. 1573. p. 24.

<sup>k</sup> Parkhurst, his tutor, intending to compare the translations of Coverdale and Tindal, gave him Tindal's translation to read, himself overlooking Coverdale's. In which collation of translations Jewel often smiled at the barbarisms in these versions, and Parkhurst could not forbear to exclaim, "Surely Paul's Cross will one day ring of this boy." Jewel's Life, prefixed to his Works,

In the placid enjoyment of literary competence, and in the cultivation of his favourite studies, Jewel had arrived at the vigour of early manhood, when the death of Edward portended a total extinction to the English Reformation. Jewel was one of the first who felt the resentment of the triumphant Papists. Before any law was enacted, or before any order was given by the Queen for the re-establishment of the Romish religion, he was expelled his College by the private authority of the Fellows. The crimes laid to his charge were, that he was a follower of Peter Martyr, that he preached doctrines contrary to the Church of Rome, and that he had taken Orders according to the laws then in force; but even those who condemned his heresy, were constrained to acknowledge the sanctity and integrity of his life.

Thus suddenly reduced to poverty, he continued still at Oxford, and the University more than requited the unkindness of his College. He not only found a place of retreat in Broadgate Hall [now Pembroke College], but was chosen Public Orator. In this capacity he penned a congratulatory Address from the University on the accession of the Queen, and executed the difficult task with such address as to satisfy Tresham, a zealous Romanist, then Vice-Chancellor, without compromising his own principles. He delicately reminded his Sovereign of her public assurance, that whatever might be her sentiments, she had no intention to change the established religion, and that this assurance had been repaid by the grateful loyalty of her subjects<sup>1</sup>.

When the disputation took place at Oxford between a Committee of the Convocation with Cranmer, Ridley, 1544 and Latimer, Jewel was an anxious and attentive witness, and doubtless, from his known predilection for the reformed doctrines, was one of the notaries in behalf of the

<sup>1</sup> There is no entire copy of the Address extant; but the heads of it are preserved in Humfrey's Life of Jewel.

two former Prelates. The disputation, while it convinced him that truth was on the Protestant side, furnished him with additional proofs of the disingenuous arts and malignant spirit of the Romanists, and must have prepared him for a farther display of their rancour towards himself<sup>m</sup>.

Religious hatred had already forced him from his College, but the malice of his enemies was not abated, and they resolved to compel the sacrifice of his conscience or his life. By the instigation of Marshal, the Dean of Christ Church, a paper was brought for his subscription, affirming the chief Articles of the Romish Creed, to which in an hour of weakness he set his name. Having no time allowed for reflection, or perhaps not daring to reflect, he hastily seized the pen, saying, “Have you a desire to see how well I write?” and gave the subscription required<sup>n</sup>.

Yet this acquiescence in no degree mitigated the enmity excited against him; and now, forsaken by his friends for his sinful compliance, persecuted by his foes for his insincere submission, and above all wounded in his conscience, he resolved to fly. This resolution he accomplished at the hazard of his life; and, after surmounting many dangers, he reached Frankfort. There he was received with kindness, because he came unexpected and un hoped for, and he made a spontaneous recantation of his subscription<sup>o</sup>. He made it in the pulpit, before the whole congregation, in these words: “It was my abject and cowardly minde, and faint heart, that made my weake hand to commit this wickednesse.” Then he applied himself to fervent prayer, first to God for His pardon, and afterwards to the Church, the whole congregation accompanying him with sighs and tears, and esteeming

<sup>m</sup> See Coll. Eccl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 331.

<sup>n</sup> The place where he subscribed was St. Mary’s Church.

<sup>o</sup> “I have confessed it openly, and unrequired.” Jewel’s Works, p. 30. Lond. 1609.

him more for his ingenuous repentance, than they would perhaps have done if he had never fallen.

Jewel remained but a short time at Frankfort, when he accepted an invitation to Strasburg from Peter Martyr. There he lived with his former instructor, sharing his hospitality, and in return participating in his literary labours. When Martyr removed to Zurich, Jewel accompanied him, and, except during a short visit of Jewel to Padua, these two friends were never separated till the return of the exiles to England.  
1556

With this extended but not disproportionate biographical notice of Jewel, there will be no space for enlarging on the characters of the exiled laity. With a few exceptions their departure was voluntary; for by a prudent and inoffensive demeanour, many laics were unmolested, even in the open profession of the reformed faith. Ascham, whose opinions were not disguised, enjoyed, by the favour of Gardiner, not only security, but an honourable station, because he was contented to remain in his own country without disturbing its government; while Cheke, who thought to preserve his conscience by flight, was seized in Flanders, compelled to a recantation, and died from the pangs of remorse.

The greatest alleviations which the English refugees could expect, under the hardships of exile, were from the charity of foreigners, or from mutual kindness and love among themselves. But they lamentably failed in both these respects. From many of the reformed Churches these unhappy exiles experienced a persecution almost as severe as that from which they had escaped. The Lutherans hated them, because they were Sacramentarians; and they were frequently expelled those cities in Germany where Lutheranism predominated. Their sufferings at home, in attestation of the Protestant faith, called forth the most indecent reproaches from the Lutheran zealots<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> Vociferantur quidam martyres Anglicos esse martyres Diaboli.

Melancthon, with his wonted humanity, rendered the most important services to their persons and their cause; but his benevolent intentions were calumniated, and often defeated.

Such of the English as sought shelter in France, Geneva, and those parts of Germany and Switzerland, where Lutheranism was not professed, were received with humanity, and were allowed places of worship. The more learned of the English Clergy, and some younger Divines, settled in Strasburg, Zurich, and Basil, for the benefit of the libraries in these cities, and with an expectation of gaining a subsistence for their literary labours. But the great body of the exiles was settled at Frankfort, and it was there that the inevitable calamities of exile were aggravated by discord; it was there that the division among the English Reformers began, which ended in an entire separation, and gave rise to a sect which ultimately succeeded in subverting the Church of England<sup>q</sup>.

Of the exiled families which first settled at Frankfort, the principal was that of Whittingham: he was a Zuinglian before he left England, and not well affected to the Liturgy or discipline of the Church<sup>r</sup>. On his application to the magistrates of Frankfort, the English families were admitted to the use of the French Church, already occupied by a French congregation. The two congregations were to meet at different hours, and a provision was insisted on

Nolim hâc contumeliâ afficere sanctum spiritum in Latimero, qui annum octogesimum egressus fuit, et in aliis sanctis viris quos novi.  
Melancthon, Ep.

<sup>q</sup> History of the Troubles at Frankfort, first printed in 1575, and reprinted in 1708, in a collection of tracts, entitled "The Phoenix," vol. ii. This history is notoriously partial to the opposers of the English Liturgy, and is thus described by Fuller: "When the writer is for the plaintiff, the discreet reader will not only be an impartial judge, but also somewhat of an advocate for the defendant."—Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. viii. p. 208.

<sup>r</sup> Heylin's Eccles. Restaur. p. 228.

by the magistrates, that the English congregation should subscribe the French confession of faith, and that if there were not an entire uniformity of ceremonies and worship, there should be no controversy about either. The English congregation, by the advice of Whittingham, adopted a form of worship widely differing from the English Liturgy, as it had been established by Edward the Sixth. It was agreed that the responses should not be pronounced aloud after the Minister; that the Litany should be omitted; and that the surplice should be no longer worn. It was farther resolved, that the title of Priest should be exchanged for that of Minister. The Liturgy, in addition to the omission of the Litany, was materially altered. Divine Service was to begin with a confession of sins, but different from that prescribed by the English Service Book, and, as it was supposed, more appropriate to the condition of an exiled Church. When the Confession was ended, a psalm, according to the metrical version of Sternhold, was to be sung by the people; after the psalm, the Minister was directed to pray for the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and then to proceed to the sermon. At the conclusion of the sermon, there was a general prayer for all estates and conditions, and particularly for England. Then the Lord's Prayer was to be read, and the Creed was to be recited; after which, the people, having sung another psalm, were to be dismissed by the Minister with a blessing. In the administration of the Holy Communion, many things enjoined by the English Ritual were to be left out, as either unnecessary or superstitious<sup>s</sup>. Having thus disguised and mutilated the English Liturgy; having used the caution of the magistrates not to dispute about forms of worship, as a pretext for an almost total conformity with those of the French congregation; they chose a Minister and Deacons for the present exigence, and opened their Church.

<sup>s</sup> History of the Troubles at Frankfort.

If the English exiles at Frankfort had been contented to use this novel form of worship, without attempting to obtrude it on others, they might have continued in its unmolested enjoyment; but they attempted to introduce it among the other English congregations, and proposed it as a model for general imitation. They sent a letter to their dispersed brethren, inviting them to Frankfort, ‘where the Word of God was duly preached, where the Sacraments were rightly administered, and where a scriptural discipline was established—advantages which could not be enjoyed elsewhere. These blessings the English had never possessed, even in their own country; but they might now possess them at Frankfort.’ But not satisfied with a description so attractive, they addressed letters to their countrymen at Strasburg, Zurich, and Basil, beseeching them to ‘send some of their Divines to Frankfort, to preside over a congregation formed after this primitive model.’ Such an address was not likely to be received with satisfaction, and still less likely to obtain compliance. The Divines at Zurich returned a decided refusal, unless they had a previous assurance that the English Service Book should be used without any alteration. The Divines at Strasburg were not quite so rigid, and consented to abate something of the English Liturgy, by way of accommodation to the solicitations of their weaker brethren<sup>t</sup>. At length three Ministers, from different cities, were prevailed to undertake the superintendence of the congregation at Frankfort: Knox was selected from Geneva, Haddon from Strasburg, and Lever from Zurich.

Of the Scottish Reformer, John Knox, it is impossible not to speak; but it is necessary to speak with caution. Let no Englishman or Episcopalian undertake the perilous

<sup>t</sup> Strasburg was situated midway between Frankfort and Zurich, and so the congregation at that place embraced a middle and moderate course between the two contending parties.—Fuller's Church History, b. viii.

task of delineating his character; let it be left as it has been finished by an able and impartial hand. “Zeal, intrepidity, and disinterestedness, he possessed in an eminent degree. He was acquainted too with the learning cultivated among Divines in that age, and excelled in that species of eloquence, which is calculated to rouse and to inflame. His maxims were impracticably severe, and the impetuosity of his temper was uncontrolled. Rigid and uncompromising himself, he shewed no indulgence to the infirmities of others; regardless of the distinctions of society, whether of rank, age, or sex, he uttered his admonitions with an acrimony and vehemence more apt to irritate than to reclaim.”

In the reign of Edward the Sixth, Knox had been induced to come into England, and was appointed one of the King’s Chaplains. His greatest delight was in itinerant preaching; he was unwilling to undertake any pastoral charge, and on that account refused to accept a parochial benefice in London. Immediately on the death of Edward he retired to Geneva, a city where Calvin enjoyed more than the authority of a Sovereign.

The apparently liberal but really despotic form of ecclesiastical government, established by Calvin at Geneva, was congenial to the aspiring and ungovernable temper of Knox, and he therefore came to Frankfort with a determination to establish in all its vigour, and with all its intolerance, the Genevan worship and discipline. The congregation was suited to its Pastor, and Knox soon ruled it with absolute sway.

Though the exiles at Zurich and Strasburg had no other power over the Frankfort congregation than that of refusing to send their Divines to officiate in it, yet this incompliance was resented as a positive injury. In a warm remonstrance addressed to the Divines at Strasburg, the Knoxians excepted against the English Liturgy, and reprobated some

<sup>a</sup> Robertson’s Hist. Scot. b. vi. p. 36. \*

of its ceremonies as unprofitable, and others as not fit to be tolerated. They were willing to use it as far as it was agreeable to the Word of God; but as to the ceremonies which it prescribed, even if they were proper to be continued, they could not be practised in a foreign country. "If," they said, "any should think that the partial disuse of this book will weaken the hands of our godly fathers and brethren, or be a disgrace to the worthy laws of King Edward, let them reflect, that they have themselves, on deliberation and change of circumstances, altered many things in it heretofore; and if God had not, in these wicked days, otherwise determined, would have altered more, and in our case they would have done as we now do." They concluded by declaring their resolution to omit the Litany and the Responses<sup>x</sup>.

This announcement was far from satisfactory, even to the moderate Divines of Strasburg, and they deputed two of their body, Chambers and Grindal, to reduce the Frankfort congregation, if possible, to a full conformity. The pretext, that the magistracy of Frankfort would not permit the English to use their own Service Book, was shewn to be absurd. There could be no doubt of obtaining consent, if there were a necessity for asking it; and it was an imperious duty of the exiled Church of England, at the present crisis, to maintain its established forms. If they were abandoned, it would seem to be a condemnation of their brethren at home, who were now sealing their faith with their blood. Well might a desertion of the peculiar faith and worship of the English Church at this time give occasion to the reproaches of its enemies.

The troubles and dissensions at Frankfort were not unknown to the imprisoned Protestants at home, and the intelligence added new poignancy to their sufferings. Ridley, in a letter to Grindal, written not long before

<sup>x</sup> History of the Troubles at Frankfort, 1575, p. xxi.

his death, defended the English Liturgy against the cavils of Knox. His objections against the Litany were so futile, that Ridley was moved to write, “ I wonder he can or dare avouch them before the learned men who are with you.” The overbearing and impetuous temper of Knox was well known to Ridley, and called from him the following animadversion: “ Surely Mr. Knox is in my mind a man of much good learning and of an earnest zeal: the Lord grant him to use them to His glory<sup>y</sup>!”

Knox having now assumed the chief direction of the Frankfort congregation, was not unprepared with an answer to the representations of the Divines at Strasburg. In a letter, probably dictated by him, it was replied, ‘ that there was no danger of incurring the charge of inconsistency, for the martyrs in England were not yielding their lives in defence of ceremonies, but of doctrines; and with respect to doctrines, there was no diversity of opinion. Therefore, if the learned Divines of Strasburg should come to Frankfort with no other view than to reduce the congregation to King Edward’s worship, and to establish the Popish ceremonies, they would better have remained at Strasburg. The laws of their own country, which had established the Service Book, were now repealed; and as for their subscription to use it, that was no longer binding, and could not hinder them from making nearer approaches to the purity and simplicity of Christian worship. The Established Church of England was no longer Protestant; they were now in a strange country, where the ceremonies and vestments gave offence. Besides, it was generally allowed, that the Book itself was imperfect; and it was credibly reported<sup>z</sup>, that the Archbishop of Canterbury had drawn up another form of Common Prayer, far more simple and pure; but that he could not procure its adoption,

<sup>y</sup> Strype’s Life of Archbishop Grindal, b. i. c. 2. p. 29. Oxon. 1821.

<sup>z</sup> This insinuation was totally void of foundation. See Fuller’s Church Hist. b. viii.

because of the corruption of the English Clergy. The English discipline was unquestionably defective, because the Liturgy lamented the want of it; and, therefore, it might be inferred, that if the English Martyrs were in similar circumstances with the exiled congregation of Frankfort, they would use the same latitude, and reform those errors which they could not reform in their own country.'

It was not surprising that the Frankfort congregation, knowing the sentiments of Knox, should have proposed to adopt the Genevan Service; but it is not so immediately apparent why Knox should have declined to accede to the proposal, till the English at Strasburg and Zurich were consulted. But till their opinion could be received, he would not allow the use of the English Service Book; and in case it was continued, he desired that his ministerial office might be confined to preaching, or he was willing to resign his office altogether.

While the affair was in suspense, Lever proposed an accommodation, and moved that the task of drawing up a Liturgy might be referred to himself, on a stipulation that he would not servilely follow either the Genevan or any other model. But when the congregation perceived that his scheme was far below their ideas of purity and reformation, the overture was rejected.

Apprehensive that some accommodation might at last take place, Knox and Whittingham made a Latin abstract of the English Liturgy, and sent it to Calvin for his judgment. What an abstract must be by such prejudiced hands it is easy to imagine: but they were not satisfied with leaving their own unfair representation to the criticism of Calvin; they obtruded their own censures, cavilling at many parts with great severity, and pretending to have concealed many blemishes from tenderness and shame\*.

Calvin certainly needed no impulse or incitement from

\* Hist. of the Troubles at Frankfort, p. xxvii.

Knox to deprecate the English Liturgy, and his answer abundantly gratified its Frankfort opponents. He complained, that ‘the contest was unseasonable,’ but freely imputed the blame to those who pressed the use of King Edward’s Service Book. ‘For himself, he was always inclined to gentleness, and it was his custom to yield to his weaker brethren in respect of ceremonies; but yet he thought it unwise to indulge the stubborn and inflexible. In the English Liturgy he could discover many tolerable fooleries, (*multæ tolerabiles ineptiæ*)<sup>b</sup>; and such blemishes, as they were not sinful, might be allowed at first: when they could not be amended they were to be endured. But it behoved the learned, grave, and godly Ministers of Christ to make a farther enterprise, and to establish a form of greater purity. If the English Reformation had continued undisturbed, an improvement ought to have taken place; but since the Church was overthrown, what should now prevent the old metal from being cast in a better mould? He could not but wonder at those, who were so fond of the dregs of Popery as to cast away such a favourable opportunity of reformation. To pretend any fear of censure from their brethren in England was chimerical; for by compliance with the godly of Frankfort, they would awaken reflection in the minds of these brethren. Then their countrymen would be led to see the gulf into which Popery had plunged them, and into what a dangerous abyss they were sunk. And thus they would be more sensible of the hollow ground on which they stood, when they found that their exiled fellow Christians had thought it safe to remove to a still greater distance.’

This decisive epistle from Calvin inspired Knox and his adherents with new boldness; but their victory was by no means complete. The admirers of Calvin translated the Genevan office, and submitted it to the congregation; but it was rejected, and the leaders of the two parties projected

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. p. xxxiii.

a form inoffensive to all. A compromise took place, by which the English and Genevan Service were to be used partially, and an agreement was signed, that this temporary arrangement should continue during four months, at the expiration of which time some permanent settlement might be adjusted <sup>c</sup>.

A short time before the expiration of the term, Cox, the late Dean of Christ Church, came to Frankfort, with several of his friends. They had an equal right to settle there with Knox and his party, and an equal right to the enjoyment of their opinions. But it is said that they infringed the contract previously made: they would recede nothing from the English Liturgy; they insisted on repeating the responses aloud after the Minister; and one of their party ascended the pulpit, and read the whole Litany. Knox could not repress his indignation; he succeeded to the possession of the pulpit, and, in a vehement harangue, taxed the Coxians with a breach of their agreement, and uttered a bitter invective against the English Liturgy; he ventured to affirm, that the late calamities had fallen on England solely as a punishment for her languid and inefficient exertions in the work of reform.

A meeting was appointed on a future day to discuss those differences, which had most unsuitably begun in the time of divine worship. An objection was raised against the right of the Coxians to vote in the congregation, but it was soon over-ruled, and Knox, by a surprising compliance, urged the propriety of admitting his opponents to an equality of privileges. The Coxians being admitted to the rights of Church-membership, were found to constitute the majority of the congregation, and, availing themselves of their superiority, drove Knox from his post, and prohibited him from preaching. The Scottish Reformer, finding that his interest with the congregation had declined, attempted to gain over the magistrates of Frankfort to his side.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. xxxvii.

Glauberg, one of the senators, was not unwilling to mediate, but being ignorant of the nature of the dispute, referred it to Valerandus, the superintendent of the French Church; and, probably from the representations of Valerandus, Glauberg insisted that the English should conform to the French, both in doctrine and ceremonies.

The matter had scarcely been thus settled, when Knox was accused by the Coxians of treason; and the charge was founded on one of his books, entitled, "An Admonition to all Christians." In this treatise he had used some unwarrantable freedoms with the Emperor Charles, his son Philip, and Mary, Queen of England. There were several obnoxious passages; but that which was deemed sufficient to prove his guilt was an averment that the Emperor was not less than Nero<sup>d</sup> an enemy to Christ. The Senate, being jealous of the imperial honour, ordered Knox to depart from the city: he obeyed the command, after having preached a farewell sermon to his party, and retired to Geneva.

Cox having thus dispossessed his rival, received a considerable accession; for, on the day when Knox left Frankfort, three Doctors and thirteen Bachelors in Divinity petitioned the Magistrates to be allowed the free use of King Edward's Service Book—a request which was readily

<sup>d</sup> The passage was this:—"O Englande, Englande, yf thou obstinately wilt returne into Egypte, that is, yf thou contracte mariage, cōfederacy, or leage, with such Princes as do mayntayne and aduaunce ydolatrye, (such as the Emperoure, which is no lesse enemy vnto Christe then euer was Nero:) yf, for the pleasure and frendshippe (I saye) of suche Princes, thou returne to thyne olde abhominacions before vsed vnder the Papistrie, then assuredly, O Englande, thou shalte be plaged and brought to desolation, by the meanes of those whose faoures thou sekest, and by whome thou arte procured to fall from Christ, and to serue Antichrist." A Faythful Admonition made by John Knox unto the possessours of God's truthe in Englande, &c. Bodl. Tanner, 65. See also his "Godly Letter, &c." in Maitland's Ess. v. Puritan Politics, p. 85.

granted. Though the Church had been formed by Cox, yet he had no views of power or influence for himself, and he refused to take any share in its government. Whitehead was at first chosen its superintendent, or principal pastor, and under him there were two elders and four deacons. Some progress was also made in the establishment of an English University. Robert Horn was the Professor of Hebrew, and Mullings read lectures on the Greek language; Traheron was appointed Professor of Theology, and Chambers made Treasurer for the contributions remitted from England.

The defeat of Knox and his party called forth the severe animadversions of Calvin. The Genevan Reformer intimated to Cox, that his countrymen were too scrupulously attached to the English ceremonies, and that there was no reason for burdening the Church with offensive customs in a place where a liberty was allowed of adopting a pure and perfect order.

When Cox had settled the Church of Frankfort, he retired to Strasburg, while Knox and a few chosen friends repaired to Geneva. In that city, where the will of Calvin was a law, Knox and his party had a Church allotted for their use, and Knox, with Goodman, was chosen Pastor of the English congregation. The rest of the Knoxians, among whom was Fox, the martyrologist, obtained a settlement at Basil.

The English congregation at Geneva, having embraced the discipline of Calvin in its full extent, published it in English, under the title of "The Service, Discipline, and Form of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva." To this book was prefixed a dedication, addressed to their brethren in England and elsewhere, which clearly announced their views. "They lauded their own discipline, as being limited within the compass of God's word, which is the only safe rule of action, and assigned the dilatory

proceedings of the Bishops in reforming Church discipline as one cause of the heavy judgments of God on England. The late Service Book of King Edward, being abolished by Parliament, could in no sense be called the established form of worship in the English Church; and there was no longer any obligation to use it farther than it was agreeable to the Word of God. Being therefore at liberty, and in a strange land, they had established such an order as, in the judgment of Calvin and other learned Divines, was most consonant with Scripture and the best reformed Churches. Their reason for laying aside the late rites and ceremonies was because they were invented by men, and, though good in their intention, had been abused, and falsely esteemed an essential part of religion. Thus Hezekiah was commended for breaking in pieces the brazen serpent, after it had been erected eight hundred years, and the high places, which had been abused to idolatry, were commanded to be destroyed. In the New Testament, the washing the feet of the disciples, as well as the love-feasts, were only temporary institutions, and they were wisely laid aside. Besides, these rites and ceremonies had caused divisions in the Church, in every age. The Galatian Christians objected to Saint Paul, that he did not observe the Jewish ceremonies like the other Apostles, and yet he observed them while there was any hope of gaining the weaker brethren: but when he perceived that some would retain them in the Church as essential, he called that, which he before accounted indifferent, wicked and profane. Similar contentions had arisen between the Greek and Latin Churches in later ages. For these and other reasons, they had thought it fit to lay aside human inventions, which had been productive of so great mischief, and had contented themselves with that wisdom which is contained in the Word of God. That Word has directed, that the Gospel shall be preached in purity, the Sacrament administered sincerely, and such

prayers used as tend to the edification of the Church, and the increase of God's glory<sup>e</sup>.

The divisions at Frankfort were not terminated, even with the departure of the leaders of the two great parties; but the contests attract little interest from the comparatively inferior characters who mingled in them. After the wars of giants, who would descend to relate the battles of pygmies? Yet such is the ungrateful task of the candid historian.

Whitehead, to whom the superintendence of the Frankfort congregation was committed by Cox, having resigned his charge, Horn succeeded to that important office; and within six months after his appointment a new division arose, from a private dispute of Horn with Ashley, one of the principal members. Horn summoned Ashley to appear before the elders and officers of the Church; Ashley appealed from them, as interested parties, to the whole congregation. The spiritual pastors of the congregation protested against such an appeal, and chose rather to resign their ministerial office, than submit to a popular decision. The congregation having been assembled on this occasion, passed a resolution, that in all controversies among themselves, and especially in cases of appeal, the last resort should be to the whole Church<sup>f</sup>. It is scarcely credible to what an excess of fierceness these disputes were carried. Letters were despatched to Cox, Sandys, and Bertie; but their efforts at mediation were vain. Jewel, who was then at Zurich, exerted his utmost endeavours to close the schism, exhorting the contending parties to live like brethren, and to lay aside all strife about matters of no importance, and not to bring a reproach on their country, and, which was worse, on their religion<sup>g</sup>.

At length these contentions engaged the attention of the magistracy, and called forth its interposition. A pre-

<sup>e</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iii. p. 98.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. p. 100.

<sup>g</sup> Life of Jewel, prefixed to his Apology.

cept was delivered in writing, advising that all past offences should be forgotten; that a new discipline should be formed, or the old discipline amended. The execution of this necessary work was advised before the ecclesiastical officers of the congregation were chosen, that the whole congregation, being on an equality, might agree on its future regulations, without bias or control. In compliance with this recommendation, fifteen persons were appointed to form a body of laws; and this committee, after some delay, completed the undertaking. The new discipline was at first subscribed by fifty-seven members of the congregation, and afterwards by twenty-eight more, and it finally received the confirmation of the magistrates. Horn, with twelve other dissentients, appealed to the magistrates; but the impugners of the old discipline gained the victory. After a short struggle, Horn and his adherents left the Frankfort congregation to their new government, and departed to Geneva<sup>b</sup>.

There seems to have existed among the exiles a strong persuasion, that the dominion of popery and cruelty in England would not be of long duration. Jewel, without advancing any claim to a supernatural revelation, was constantly repeating this consolatory aphorism: "These things will not last an age." Fox, the martyrologist, carried his pretensions higher, and in a sermon delivered to his banished countrymen at Basil, told them, that the time was come for their return to England, and that he brought the welcome news by the command of God. He was at the time sharply reproved by the graver divines then present, for his presumption, but was excused afterwards by the event; for it was found that Queen Mary died on the day before Fox thus presaged<sup>i,\*</sup>.

The intelligence was communicated with an astonishing

<sup>b</sup> Hist. of the Troubles of Frankfort, p. clxxxvi.

<sup>i</sup> Life of Foxe, by his son, prefixed to the 9th ed. of *Acts and Mon.*

[\* See Brit. Crit. vol. xiii. on the conduct of Foxe the martyrologist in the Frankfort Troubles.]

rapidity. The death of the Queen was known at Rome on the ninth day after it happened<sup>k</sup>; and it was known at Zurich in less than a fortnight<sup>l</sup>. The exiles were not long in preparing for their return; and it is pleasing to close the narrative by recording, that, although calamity could not teach them brotherly kindness, yet, when their hearts were dilated with joy, better sentiments for a time predominated. Conciliatory letters were mutually written. Those of Geneva desired an interchange of forgiveness, and prayed their brethren of Frankfort to unite with them, on their return, in preaching the sincere Word of God; but at the same time they earnestly implored an union in procuring such a form of worship, as was practised in the best reformed Churches abroad. To this request the divines of Frankfort replied, that it was beyond their power to prescribe a form of worship or discipline to the kingdom of England; but they had determined to submit to indifferent things, and they trusted that their brethren of Geneva would follow their example. Both parties joined, and vied with each other in offering congratulations to their new Queen, and they had nothing more substantial to offer. They came home, bringing with them much experience as well as learning, and they were destitute of every thing else<sup>m</sup>. But they entertained a reasonable hope, that these qualities would recommend them to a Princess, who, like themselves, had been trained in the school of affliction; and that the Protestant faith would regain its ascendancy in England on THE ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH.

<sup>k</sup> Parker de Antiq. Brit. Eccl. p. 534.

<sup>l</sup> Peter Martyr's Letters.

<sup>m</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. i. part i. p. 191.

## CHAPTER XV.

Policy of Elizabeth.—Notification of her Succession to the different Courts of Europe.—Reply of Philip, and of the Pope.—Associates Protestants with Papists in the Privy Council.—Prisoners on account of Religion released.—Coronation of the Queen.—Meeting of Parliament.—Act of Supremacy, and Court of High Commission.—Act of Uniformity.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Disputation in Westminster Abbey.—Liturgy of Edward the Sixth, with some modifications, restored.—Appointment of Parker to the See of Canterbury, and his Consecration.—Protestant Episcopacy restored.—Treatment of the Romish Prelates.

THE reign of Elizabeth has been rightly considered as the period in which the Church of England attained its complete settlement. “No man, who truly understands the English Reformation, will derive it from Henry the Eighth, for he only gave the occasion; it was his son who began, and Queen Elizabeth that perfected it<sup>n</sup>.” The conduct and address with which this Princess supported the Protestant faith, assailed by Popery and Puritanism, and the constancy of her adherence to it amidst all the dangers which threatened her person, her crown, and her country, entitle her to the commendation and gratitude of posterity.

Yet the reign of Elizabeth was not the age of civil or religious liberty; the Queen was despotic in every thing, and especially in her religious government. Still, however, her conduct was more the result of the perilous circumstances in which she was placed, than of her natural disposition, in itself sufficiently domineering. She had to contend against two kinds of tyranny, popish and puritanical, each striving for the mastery, and both seeking to control the civil power; and it was not by a timid, a

<sup>n</sup> King Charles I. in reply to Alexander Henderson, Rel. Sac. Carolinæ, vol. ii. p. 197. Hague, 1650.

conciliating, or a liberal policy, that either could be subdued. Her policy was guided by the emergency of the case, and, like that of the Dictator in the Roman Republic, her primary maxim was, "that the realm should suffer no detriment."

Let it be also recollected, that in the reign of Elizabeth the people had acquired a considerable degree of intelligence and refinement, and were less willing to submit to arbitrary power. In this reign the voice of the people was first heard, through its natural organ, the House of Commons. Originally this part of the constitution was a balance on the side of the Crown, against the enormous power of the nobility; but when the feudal system was broken down, the balance of the Commons was shifted, and was a counterpoise against the growing power of the Monarchy. In this reign the Commons were not strong enough to resist, but had sufficient boldness to remonstrate against the imperious conduct of their Sovereign. These preliminary observations are necessary to form a just estimate of the policy of Elizabeth.

The intelligence of Mary's death was first publicly signified to the Lords lately assembled in Parliament, and was then communicated to the House of Commons by Heath, Archbishop of York and Lord Chancellor. In his speech he observed, that the loss of their late Sovereign would have been far more afflictive, if they had not a successor whose right and title to the Crown were indisputable. The Prelates and the temporal nobility intended to proclaim Elizabeth, and only waited for the Commons to join in the proclamation. The whole assembly echoed their mutual consent with loud and repeated shouts of "God save Queen Elizabeth, long and happily may she reign!"

The Parliament being dissolved by the demise of the Crown, some of the nobility went into the city, where proclamation of Elizabeth was again made by the Lord Mayor,

and was received with the same lively expressions of joy. The Queen was at Hadfield when she heard the intelligence of her sister's death and of her own succession, and she lost not a moment in proceeding to London. All the Bishops met her at Highgate on her entrance into the city, and, with the exception of Boner, they were received graciously. By the citizens she was welcomed with the loudest acclamations. On the next day she went to the Tower, and at her entrance fell on her knees, and offered thanks to God for the change in her condition. Once she entered the fortress of London as a prisoner, now she was its Sovereign, and the Sovereign of England.

Messengers were soon despatched by her to the different Courts of Europe, announcing the death of the late Queen, and her consequent succession. To Philip, King of Spain, she wrote a particular and grateful acknowledgment of his generous interference when she was the object of her sister's unjust suspicion. She also directed Sir Edward Karn, the English Ambassador at Rome, to inform the Pope of the change in the government. Sir Henry Killigrew was sent privately to form an alliance with the Protestant Princes of Germany, and there were accredited Ambassadors sent to the Courts of Denmark and Holstein<sup>o</sup>.

Philip not only returned a public assurance of his friendship, together with his congratulations, but sent a secret proposal of marriage. He was not only desirous of retaining his title and interest in England, but was apprehensive that the British dominions might be united with those of France, by the pretensions of Mary, Queen of Scotland, to the English Crown. He therefore proposed to obtain a papal dispensation to legalize his marriage with the sister and successor of his former consort.

The Pope, Paul the Fourth, returned an answer to the communication of Elizabeth in his accustomed tone of

<sup>o</sup> Camden's Elizabeth, p. 4.

haughty condescension. England, he declared, was no more than a fief of the Apostolic See, and Elizabeth, being illegitimate, was incapable of inheriting the Crown. It was impossible for him to contradict the decisions of his predecessors, Clement the Seventh and Paul the Third, with respect to her illegitimacy. He was highly offended by her assumption of the regal dignity without his consent, on which account she deserved no favour at his hands ; yet, if she would renounce her pretensions, and refer herself entirely to him, he would shew to her a fatherly affection, and all the favour which was consistent with the honour of the Apostolic See.

To the overture of Philip, Elizabeth gave such an answer as would neither wound his feelings, nor totally extinguish his hopes. Interest and conscience alike forbade her acceptance of the proposal of marriage ; but interest prompted her to retain the personal friendship and the political alliance of the King of Spain. Her counsellors wisely suggested, that to obtain a papal dispensation for her marriage would be highly impolitic, if possible ; but that, in spite of Philip's solicitations, the Court of France would probably prevail with the Pope to refuse it. The French King had already urged the Pope on this point, and, in addition to this act of indirect hostility, had openly supported the pretensions of the Queen of Scotland to the English Crown. The Pope would naturally join with the King of France, because Mary was strongly attached to the Romish religion.

While Elizabeth was careful to preserve the friendship of Philip, at the same time that she rejected his offer, she was regardless of the favour or displeasure of the Pope. His insolent message she met by a silent but significant demonstration of resentment ; she recalled the credentials of her ambassador at the Papal Court, and commanded his immediate return.

In the critical situation of her early government, Elizabeth

found it advisable to intermix Protestants and Papists in her Council<sup>p</sup>; but the tendency of her religious opinions it was needless as well as impossible to conceal. While under the power of her sister, she outwardly conformed to the religion of the Romish Church; but this conformity was the effect of terror. It is not to be interpreted to the prejudice of Elizabeth's sincerity, more than the written renunciation of the Pope's supremacy which Mary gave to her father, but which on her accession to power she immediately falsified. Elizabeth, unlike Mary, gave no pledge to her subjects, which she was predetermined to forfeit. Her education had inclined her to the Protestant faith, and she had the same motive with her sister Mary, to strengthen her attachment to the faith in which she had been educated; it was the religion of her mother. In the daughter of Anne Boleyn, the Reformers might expect to find a protector and a friend.

These early prepossessions of Elizabeth were visible in the selection of her confidential ministers; for soon after her accession, she called to her administration Sir William Cecil and Sir Nicholas Bacon. To the former of these statesmen the Church of England is more deeply indebted than to any other laic. The plan of its legal establishment was formed under his immediate inspection, and he laid the basis of its future polity, rendering the regal supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs compatible with the divine institution of a Christian priesthood.

<sup>p</sup> The Roman Catholic part were Heath, Archbishop of York, the Marquis of Winchester, the Earl of Arundel, the Earl of Shrewsbury, the Earl of Derby, the Earl of Pembroke, Lord Clinton, Lord Howard of Effingham, Sir Thomas Cheyney, Sir William Petre, Sir John Mason, Sir Richard Sackville, and Dr. Nicholas Wotton, Dean of Canterbury. The Protestants were the Marquis of Northampton, the Earl of Bedford, Sir Thomas Parr, Sir Edward Rogers, Sir Ambrose Cave, Sir Francis Knolles, Sir William Cecil, and Sir Nicholas Bacon. Camden's *Elizabeth*, p. 2, 3.

One of the first acts of Elizabeth after her accession was, like that of Mary, an act of grace: she set at liberty all who had been imprisoned in the late reign on account of religion. Having been pleasantly told that there were some prisoners not included in this act of grace, and that they were no others than the four Evangelists, whom the people earnestly wished to be set at liberty; she replied in the same strain of pleasantry, that she would first communicate with the prisoners themselves, and see whether they desired such a release.

The principle on which she acted throughout her whole reign actuated her at its commencement, and this was a conciliation between the Papists and the Protestants; what she thus did from policy was in conformity with her own religious opinions. Though a determined foe of Papal jurisdiction, she was attached to the ancient ritual. She thought that a too great deference had been shewn to foreign Reformers, in regard of discipline; and that through their suggestion divine worship had been divested of many of its decencies. If possible, she would have exploded the names of heretic and papist; but as this was scarcely to be expected, she endeavoured to mitigate personal hostility where she could not reconcile difference of opinion.

Little could Elizabeth adventure to do before the meeting of Parliament; but that little she was not slow to perform. Some of those who had been imprisoned on account of religion, being now released, and others in exile being permitted to return, had already made use of the Service Book of King Edward, presuming on the countenance of government. This imprudent precipitance occasioned a proclamation, directed equally against the Papists and the Reformers; for both parties had seized the opportunity of declaring their religious sentiments from the pulpit<sup>a</sup>. All preaching therefore was prohibited, unless

<sup>a</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. i. c. i. p. 58.

by a licence under the Great Seal ; and no other doctrine was allowed than that of reading, without any exposition, the Epistles, Gospels, and the Ten Commandments. These might be read in English, with the addition of the Lord's Prayer, the Litany, and the Creed. The other part of the Service was to be regulated by the Rubric of the Missals and Breviaries, till the Queen and Parliament had deliberated, whether a reformation in the Service should take place. In her own chapel, she permitted the altar to remain with its appropriate ornaments ; but she forbade the elevation of the host.

Previously to the meeting of Parliament, Heath was removed from his office of Lord Chancellor, and Sir Nicholas Bacon was appointed to that high station ; and the ceremony of the Coronation was performed with the customary solemnities. On the day preceding, the Queen proceeded from the Tower to Westminster with great state. As she ascended her chariot, she raised her eyes to heaven, and blessed God, who had preserved her to see that joyful day. She acknowledged that her deliverance proceeded only from that Divine Being to Whom she ascribed the praise. No part of her behaviour was more gratifying than in a circumstance which occurred as she passed under one of the triumphal arches. A Bible was let down before her, by a female child representing Truth ; with the greatest reverence, and with the most impressive demonstrations of gratitude, it was received by Elizabeth : she laid it next her heart, professing that she valued the sacred gift more than all the magnificent presents, which had been offered to her on that day.

The Coronation was performed at Westminster Abbey by Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, according to the forms of the Romish pontifical. No other Bishop could be persuaded to perform the ceremonial ; for although of the Protestant Prelates made by King Edward, Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale were still alive, yet Elizabeth preferred to

be crowned by a Bishop actually in office, and according to the old Ritual<sup>r</sup>.

A few days after the Coronation, the Parliament was opened by a speech from the Lord Chancellor; his discourse was divided into three parts, of which the first concerned religion. In this part, which, as it related to the honour of Almighty God, was the Queen's principal concern, he exhorted the two Houses to consider its distracted state, and to enter into its discussion without heat or partiality. The Queen recommended them to avoid the two extremes of idolatry and superstition on the one hand, and of profaneness and irreligion on the other. She trusted that they would pursue their examination without sophistical niceties or subtle speculations, and endeavour to adjust difficult questions, so as to bring the people to an uniformity and cordial agreement.

One of the first questions which came under the consideration of the House of Commons was, whether the want of the title of Supreme Head of the Church, which the Queen had not yet assumed, was a good reason for nullifying the Acts concerning religion, which had been passed in former Parliaments, or which were intended to be passed in the Parliament now assembled? After a long discussion, it was determined that the omission did not nullify or vitiate such enactments.

The first Bill introduced into the House of Lords on the subject of religion was for the restitution of the tenths and first-fruits of ecclesiastical benefices to the Crown. Though it was unanimously passed by the temporal Peers, yet it met the dissent and protestation of all the Prelates who were present; but it was easily passed by the Commons, and received the royal assent<sup>s</sup>. By this Act, not only the tenths and first-fruits were restored to the Crown,

<sup>r</sup> Collier's Ecclesiastical History, part ii. b. vi. p. 191.

<sup>s</sup> Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 4.

but also the impropriated benefices which had been surrendered by Queen Mary.

Both Houses of Parliament being equally solicitous to recognise the title of the Queen, an Act was framed, which went effectually to the completion of their object, while, at the same time, it avoided all questions of doubt and controversy. It was supposed to have been framed by Cecil, and was remarkable for its delicacy and moderation. Without exposing the errors of her father, or the harsh treatment of her sister, the Act declared in general terms, that “the two Houses of Parliament did assuredly believe the Lady Elizabeth by the laws of God and the realm to be their lawful Queen<sup>t</sup>.”

The Parliament now began its legislative proceedings on the subject of religion, with that temper which the royal message had so powerfully recommended. Many of the penal laws passed in the late reign were repealed; and there was a general enactment that no one should be molested for exercising the religion used in the last year of King Edward. Divine Service was to be performed in English: the religious houses founded by Mary were suppressed, and their revenues annexed to the Crown.

The two principal Statutes passed in this Session, by which the national religion was reformed from Popery, were the ACT OF SUPREMACY, and the ACT OF UNIFORMITY. The first of these Statutes formed the basis of the ecclesiastical government; and the last that of public worship.

The ACT OF SUPREMACY was entitled, “An ACT for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiastical, and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same<sup>u</sup>.” It was the same in effect with an ACT passed in the reign of Henry the Eighth<sup>x</sup>, but fell short of that Statute in severity. By this ACT, all jurisdictions and ecclesiastical privileges which had been heretofore used

<sup>t</sup> Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 3.      <sup>u</sup> Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 1.      <sup>x</sup> Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19.

by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power were for ever united and annexed to the imperial Crown of the realm. All appeals to Rome were prohibited; and the subject was exonerated from all impositions and exactions paid to that Court. The Statute likewise prohibited all publishing or teaching, and all other acts and deeds, by which any foreign jurisdiction might be maintained.

The Statute was accompanied by an oath of supremacy, which was enjoined to be taken by all ecclesiastics, on penalty of forfeiting their promotions, and of being incapacitated from holding any public office. In this oath, the title of Supreme Head, formerly claimed by the Crown, was omitted; and the omission arose, as it is said, from a conscientious scruple, rather than from a wish to conciliate the Papists. The scruple was suggested by Lever, an exiled Divine of eminence, and a favoured disciple of Calvin<sup>y</sup>.

But the Act of Supremacy must not be dismissed without observing, that it empowered the Queen to erect a Court as unconstitutional in its formation as it was arbitrary and oppressive in its conduct; for on a clause in this Act was founded the HIGH COMMISSION COURT for the exercise of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Commissioners might be either churchmen or laymen, they were to be appointed by letters patent under the Great Seal, and their powers were of the most comprehensive nature, and extended to all kinds of enormities, from heresy to a contempt of court. Their authority with respect to heresy was restrained by a provision, that nothing was to be deemed heresy which had not been already adjudged heretical by the express and plain words of canonical Scripture, or by either of the four first General Councils; or which should be hereafter adjudged heretical by the

<sup>y</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. vi. no. 48. and vol. ii. b. iii. p. 772.

High Court of Parliament with the consent of the Clergy in Convocation.

The Commissioners being thus appointed could exercise with greater injury, and with greater impunity, those powers which had been granted by Henry the Eighth to a single individual: their authority was irresponsible because collective. A man was liable to be condemned by this Court for an opinion which he did not think heretical, till the ecclesiastical judge had so interpreted the words of canonical Scripture. The Court soon entangled itself in the inextricable mazes of the canon law, and like that extended its jurisdiction over matters of a secular nature. It was a Court not only without appeal, but a prohibition from the temporal courts, though of force against other ecclesiastical judicatories, was seldom allowed by the Commissioners.

When the Act of Supremacy was brought into the House of Lords, it experienced the unanimous opposition of the Bishops. Heath argued that the supremacy implied a spiritual jurisdiction, and to grant such a power to a temporal Sovereign was not only a dangerous novelty but a contradiction. If spiritual supremacy belonged to a kingly office, then it must follow that Herod was supreme head of the Christian Church at Jerusalem, and Nero of that at Rome. Scott, Bishop of Chester, spoke on the same side, but with less force than Heath.

To have established the regal supremacy would have been an imperfect measure unless it had been strengthened by another, the Act of Uniformity. Lest the Clergy, in Convocation, might enact any Canons, contrary to the Statutes about to be passed in Parliament, the Queen had issued a requisition prohibiting that body from the exercise of such a power on pain of a "præmunire." Yet Harpsfield, the Prolocutor, and the Lower House, made a last effort in favour of the Romish faith. Certain articles were laid before the Bishops in order to be presented to

Parliament, and they decidedly asserted the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome. But when they were presented to the Lord Keeper by Boner, no reply was vouchsafed, and all the effect which this measure of the Convocation produced was that of bringing on a public disputation between the Romanists and the Reformers.

A conference, by the Queen's command, was appointed to take place in Westminster Abbey, before the Privy Council and both Houses of Parliament, between nine Bishops and nine Protestant Divines<sup>z</sup>. The disputation was limited to three questions: 1. Whether it was not contrary to Scripture, and the custom of the ancient Church, to use a tongue unknown to the people in the Common Prayer and Sacraments? 2. Whether every Church has not authority to appoint, change, and take away, ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same were done to edifying? 3. Whether it could be proved by the word of God that in the Mass there was a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead and living?

The proposal for a conference was first made to Heath, and having been communicated by him to his brethren was accepted, though with some unwillingness. The disputation was to be carried on in writing, and the Bishops, on account of their rank, were first to read their arguments. That the disputation might be managed with greater decency, the Lord Chancellor presided, without any authority to moderate between the parties, or to overrule any point in the controversy.

The Bishops violated the preliminaries of the disputation by coming unprovided with any written arguments; but having received a reprimand from the President, Cole was

<sup>z</sup> The nine Divines on the Romish side were the Bishops of Winchester, Lichfield, Chester, Carlisle, and Lincoln, with Doctors Cole, Harpsfield, Longdale, and Chidsey. The Protestant Divines were Scory, late Bishop of Chichester, Cox, Whitehead, Grindal, Horn, Sandys, Guest, Aylmer, and Jewel.

nominated to deliver verbally their opinion on the first article. He was answered by Horn on the Protestant side, and with such satisfaction to the whole auditory, that the Romanists would not resume the conference after the first day. The Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln said, that the doctrine of the Catholic Church was already established, and that it was an encouragement to heretics to permit it to be called in question before an unlearned multitude. They added, that the Queen had incurred excommunication, a sentence which they threatened to inflict not only on herself, but also on her Council. For this intemperate declaration they were sent to the Tower, and as the Romanists retired from the field of combat, the Protestants were left in its undisputed possession.

The Romanists having been thus vanquished, the Queen next endeavoured to secure an union among the Protestants ; for although the troubles of Frankfort had been appeased, and letters of reconciliation had been exchanged between the contending parties, there was the same discordancy of opinion ready to display itself in open hostility. Some were desirous of introducing the Service and discipline which the English had used when at Geneva ; while others were in favour of the Liturgy of Edward. Some were desirous of abolishing episcopacy, and of using no rites and ceremonies which were used by the Church of Rome ; while others thought it expedient to withdraw no farther from the Church of Rome than was necessary to preserve purity of faith, and the independence of the national Church.

The last were the sentiments of the Queen herself, and they influenced her in the settlement of the English Liturgy. A Committee of Divines<sup>a</sup> was appointed to review the Second Service Book of King Edward the Sixth, and to adopt it as the groundwork of the new form of

<sup>a</sup> The Committee consisted of Parker, Grindal, Cox, Pilkington, May, Bill, Whitehead, Sandys, Guest, and Sir Thomas Smith.

Common Prayer. It was the chief aim of Elizabeth to unite the nation in religious worship if not in religious opinion, and she was not less solicitous to include the Romanists, if such a comprehension could be effected without a compromise of Protestant principles. A great part of the nation still believed the corporal presence in a qualified or unqualified sense, and therefore the Committee was recommended to expunge from the Liturgy any express definition in its condemnation. In consequence, a Rubric in the Service Book of Edward was omitted, explaining that the act of kneeling at the Communion was not intended as an adoration of Christ's natural flesh and blood. In the first Liturgy of Edward, the words used by the Priest, on the delivery of the elements, were consistent with a belief in the corporal presence, though not necessarily implying it: in the second Liturgy a form of words was substituted, incompatible with such a belief, though not offensively condemning it. But in the Liturgy of Elizabeth both forms were, with great felicity, united. The Committee of Divines had left it at liberty whether the posture of kneeling or standing should be used at receiving the Communion, but the Parliament restrained it to kneeling. In the Litany, among other deprecations, was one "from the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities;" but this passage, introduced by the Reformers of Edward, was justly thought inconsistent with the charitable spirit which should ever accompany prayer. However strongly error may be impugned in Articles and Canons, in our addresses to Heaven it should ever be remembered that we are all fallible, as well as sinful.

Besides these alterations, there were other deviations from the second Service Book of King Edward. The Rubric, directing the Order for Morning and Evening Service, was altered, and it was to be performed in the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel, with the additional direction, that the chancels were to remain

as in time past. The habits enjoined by the first Book of King Edward, and prohibited by the second, were restored, and were commanded to be retained, until some "other order should take place herein, by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the Commissioners authorized under the Great Seal of England for causes ecclesiastical." Different interpretations were drawn from this clause, but the true interpretation was found to be, that the present regulation was not intended to be temporary, but permanent, and that no other order was ever intended to be taken.

The additions to the Liturgy consisted principally of Prayers for the Queen and Clergy in the Daily Service of Morning and Evening. These Prayers were taken from the Sacramentary of Saint Gregory, but were inserted now in the English Liturgy for the first time. A selection of Lessons was also made for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the year.

The Liturgy having been duly prepared, the Bill authorizing its use was first brought into the House of Commons, where it passed without debate; but in the House of Lords it was encountered by the decided hostility of all the Prelates, because the Episcopacy was decidedly popish. The principal speakers were Heath, Archbishop of York; Scot, Bishop of Chester; both of whom had opposed the Act of Supremacy; together with Fecknam, Abbot of Westminster, who still retained his seat in the House of Lords. Heath's speech has been characterized as "rather elegant than learned<sup>b</sup>." Having enlarged on the several changes which had been made in the reign of King Edward, he asserted, that both Cranmer and Ridley had often altered their opinions on the corporal presence. He argued, that an Act of such importance ought not to pass, until it had received the assent of the Clergy in Convocation. "Not only the orthodox," he observed, "but

<sup>b</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. iii. p. 785.

even the Arian emperors, commanded that points of faith should be settled and examined in ecclesiastical councils; and Gallio, by the light of nature, knew that a civil judge ought not to meddle in matters of religion<sup>c.</sup>" The Bishop of Chester said, that the Bill was contrary to faith and charity; that arguments once settled were not again to be brought in question; and that Acts of Parliament were improper rules of religious belief. Fecknam laid down three rules by which religion ought to be judged, its antiquity, its consistency, and its influence on the civil government. In the words of Saint Augustin, he recommended adherence to the Catholic Church; and he insinuated, that the consent of the whole Church in all ages ought to weigh more than the crude notions of a few preachers, who had distracted both Germany and England.

The speeches of the temporal Peers on the other side of the question have not been preserved; but it cannot be supposed, that the numerical superiority of the Protestants in the division was obtained without some arguments adduced in their favour. The Act of Uniformity finally passed, with the dissent of nine Prelates and nine temporal Lords<sup>d.</sup>

When the Session of Parliament had closed, the oath of supremacy was tendered to all the Bishops, and it was refused by all, with the exception of Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff, whom Camden calls "the calamity of his see." On their refusal, they were all committed to prison; but, with the exception of Boner, White, and Watson, were soon restored to liberty. These three Prelates had been the principal instruments of Mary's cruelties, and im-

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 786.

<sup>d</sup> The Prelates were, the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of London, Ely, Worcester, Llandaff, Lichfield, Exeter, Chester, and Carlisle: the temporal Peers were, the Marquis of Winchester, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Viscount Montague, and the Barons Morly, Stafford, Dudley, Wharton, Rich, and North.—Collier's Eccles. Hist. p. ii. b. 6. p. 238.

prisonment was thought only a gentle punishment. A few inferior dignitaries, joining with the Bishops in their refusal to take the oath, were also deprived; but of the inferior Clergy not more than eighty incurred the penalty of disobedience to the Statute<sup>e</sup>.

Since the death of Cardinal Pole, the see of Canterbury had remained vacant, and this circumstance, joined with the non-compliance of so many Prelates, rendered the succession of a Protestant Episcopacy the object of Elizabeth's solicitude. There were only three of King Edward's Bishops alive, Scory, Barlow, and Coverdale, besides Hodgskins, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford; but a strong expectation was entertained, that Heath, Thirlby, and Tonstal, would again conform to an establishment far more consonant with their opinions than that to which they had conformed in the reign of King Edward.

Elizabeth had long fixed on a Divine, whose qualities she well knew and approved, to preside over the Protestant Church of England. Matthew Parker in his early life had filled the office of Chaplain to Anne Boleyn, and a short time before the death of that unfortunate Princess, she had imposed on him the solemn duty of superintending the education of her infant daughter, and of instructing her in the rudiments of Christianity. This sacred trust was not neglected by Parker, and its conscientious fulfilment was always acknowledged with gratitude by Elizabeth. Her early instructor had not been undistinguished by Henry or Edward; and at the accession of Mary, he held the Mastership of Corpus Christi College, in the University of Cambridge, a Prebend in the Cathedral of Ely, and the Deanery of Lincoln. But when Mary ascended the throne, he was deprived of all his preferments; and two strong

<sup>e</sup> According to Burnet, 189 of all grades out of 9,400: Camden and Cardinal Allen compute the whole number of the deprived Clergy, including Bishops, Dignitaries, and Parochial Ministers, at two hundred and forty-three.—See Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 133.

reasons contributed to his deprivation : he was a decided Protestant, and he was married. Thus reduced from an honourable independence to penury, he retired into obscurity, hoping at least to find safety : he did not, like many of his brethren, retire into exile ; but, without sacrificing his opinions, nobly resolved to await persecution in his own country. He was frequently exposed to the most imminent dangers, and obliged to change his abode ; but his behaviour under his sufferings he has himself related, and the following edifying reflections are worthy to be transcribed. “ After my deprivation, I lived so joyful before God in my conscience, and so neither ashamed nor dejected, that the most sweet leisure for study, to which the good providence of God recalled me, created much greater and more solid pleasure than my former dangerous and busy kind of living pleased me. What will hereafter happen to me, I know not ; but to God, who takes care for all, and who will one day reveal the hidden things of men’s hearts, I commend myself wholly, and my godly and most chaste wife, and my dear little ones<sup>f</sup>. ”

When his early pupil became his Sovereign, it was not likely that his merits and his misfortunes should be forgotten : he reasonably expected to be restored to competence and peace ; but more than these he wished not. An employment of the annual value of twenty nobles was desired in preference of any high dignity, and he courted a situation in the University of Cambridge, where he had spent his youth in useful activity, and where he hoped to pass his declining years in quietness. General expectation, however, was soon turned towards him as one who would not be permitted to “ rest long in his cell<sup>g</sup>. ” Bacon and Cecil intimately knew his worth, and concurred in promoting the intentions of the Queen, and, what was more

<sup>f</sup> Strype’s Life of Parker, b. i. c. 7. p. 65.

<sup>g</sup> Sandys’s Letter to Parker, in Burnet’s Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. iii. no. 2.

difficult, in conquering the reluctance of Parker to accept her proffered patronage.

The unwillingness of Parker to emerge from his literary retirement and to engage in an active life was unfeigned ; and when he knew that he was designated for the highest ecclesiastical station, he wrote to the Lord Chancellor, setting forth in the strongest language his inability to discharge so arduous an office in times so dangerous. Fully was he aware of the requisites for the station, and that it was necessary to fill the see with a man who was neither arrogant, timid, nor covetous. An arrogant man would, perhaps, divide from his brethren in doctrine, whereas the whole strength and safety of the Church lay in unity ; a timid man would raise the spirits of its enemies, and increase the jealousies within itself ; and a covetous man was “profitable in no state of the community to serve it rightly.” As for himself, he knew the unfitness both of his body and mind so well, that though he was unwilling to offend his partial friends, and especially the Queen ; yet he must still more avoid the indignation of God, and not enter on a station which he could not fulfil, so as to answer either to God or the world for his administration. He knew of what he was capable ; he was poor, and unable to meet the expenses of such a dignity ; he was infirm, and therefore was unfit for so active an employment. He had a very few years of life in prospect, and he had no wish to accumulate a large fortune for his family. Besides these objections, he saw that great divisions were likely to happen among the Protestants, which would be a cause of exultation to the Church of Rome : he saw that some men were men still, even after all their teaching in the school of affliction<sup>b</sup>.

This representation from Parker only tended to confirm the Queen in her resolution, and his friends in their

<sup>b</sup> Parker's Letter to Sir N. Bacon, in Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. iii. no. 8.

judgment. Bacon replied, that if he knew any man with whom the character described in Parker's letter agreed better than with its author, he would choose that man; but not knowing such, he must abide by his first choice. Parker, wearied by an importunity which proceeded so far as to threaten him with imprisonment, at last yielded; and writing to the Queen herself, protested that extreme necessity had forced him to trouble her, both out of conscience to God, and regard to her service. He knew his great unworthiness for so high a function; in an inferior office he would cheerfully discharge his duty, and if he could be placed in a situation suitable to his infirmities. But in the conclusion, he submitted himself entirely to her pleasure, rather than that the loyalty and sincerity of his heart should be suspected, even by a just allegation of his own unworthiness<sup>i</sup>.

The legal forms for the appointment of Parker were expedited, but the consecration was delayed for several months. A serious difficulty opposed the speedy performance of that solemn ceremony. Many of the Bishops who had refused the Oath of Supremacy still kept possession of their sees, and the Queen still expected that at least three of these Prelates would be induced to comply with the law. A commission for the consecration of the new Archbishop was directed to the Bishops of Durham, Bath and Wells, Peterborough, and Llandaff, together with Barlow and Scory, who were styled in the commission Bishops, though not in the actual possession of any sees. The three Bishops first named in the commission having refused to proceed to the consecration, a new commission passed under the Great Seal, directed to Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff; Barlow, Bishop Elect of Chichester; Scory, Bishop Elect of Hereford; Coverdale, late Bishop of Exeter; Hodgskins, Bishop Suffragan of Bedford; John,

<sup>i</sup> Parker's Letter to Queen Elizabeth, in Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. ii. b. iii. no. 8.

Suffragan of Thetford ; and Bale, Bishop of Ossory, authorizing all or any four of them to consecrate Parker Archbishop of Canterbury. The Bishop of Llandaff, though he had taken the Oath of Supremacy, declined to assist in the consecration, probably by the instigation of Boner ; but four of the Bishops named in the commission, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgsins, consented. They met at the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, in Cheapside, where, according to custom, the election of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury was confirmed.

All the preliminaries having been performed according to law, Parker was consecrated by the four Bishops in the chapel of Lambeth. The ceremonial was that prescribed by the Ordinal of King Edward, which, together with the rest of the Liturgy, had been restored by the late Act of Uniformity.

The consecration of Parker is an event which demands something more than a minute and accurate statement of its circumstances ; it cannot be dismissed without some reflections. Its validity has been impugned from a design of invalidating the episcopal succession of the Church of England. The Romanists have objected, that our Priesthood has no divine authority, and is therefore incapable of performing the administration of divine offices with effect. They pretend, that our Holy Orders have not been derived as they ought to have been, and as those in the Church of Rome are, by an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles, from Christ Himself ; and that the Apostolical succession, so essential to a Christian Ministry, was broken in the English Church at the consecration of Parker. This consecration was uncanonical, because the persons engaged in it had been legally deprived by Queen Mary, and had not been legally or canonically restored, and their episcopal authority was derived only from the Great Seal of England.

To this allegation it has been sufficiently answered, that

the persons engaged in the consecration, having been once invested with the episcopal character, that character was indelible, and that their deprivation under Queen Mary took place before a reconciliation was effected with the See of Rome, and by no other than a commission instituted by royal authority. The episcopal character remained in these deprived Bishops, even during their exile, and they had the power of communicating it before they regained temporal possession of their sees. The episcopal power of Coverdale and Hodgsins was not less valid, because they never exercised it afterwards ; nor that of Scory and Coverdale, because they were consecrated by an Ordinal different from that of the Church of Rome ; nor that of Hodgsins, because he was only a Suffragan Bishop. The assistance of Coverdale and Hodgsins, in the present consecration, was a voluntary act, and their ceasing afterwards to perform any other episcopal function was equally voluntary. The Ritual of Edward the Sixth retained all which was necessary to confer the episcopal character, all which was practised in the primitive ages, and all which had been retained by the Greek Church. The institution of Suffragan Bishops is known to the Church of Rome, and their power is recognised as rightful and sufficient.

It has been also answered, that when a Church is overrun with error, or otherwise unsettled in its constitution, it cannot be bound by those rules, to which it may rigidly adhere in a pure and settled state. When the Arian Bishops were dispossessed of some of the chief sees on account of their heresy, the orthodox Bishops ordained others in their room, without a strict attention to the Canons usually and properly observed.

Neither has the objection of the Romanists any weight, that the Bishops of a province cannot, according to primitive custom and the canon law, consecrate their own superior, and invest him with an authority over themselves. Such

was the course anciently adopted in the isle of Cyprus, where the Suffragan Bishops always consecrated their own Metropolitan, and were maintained in that right by the Council of Ephesus<sup>k</sup>.

It has been also objected, not only that the consecration was uncanonical, and consequently invalid, but that it was performed in a clandestine, indecent, and even in a profane manner<sup>1</sup>. This aspersion has been propagated by infidels, who might have known its falsehood, but it has been refuted by those whose prejudices against episcopacy might have induced them to believe it, if it had been credible. The calumny was unknown to the earliest assailants of the Protestant hierarchy, and was not invented till forty years after the transaction; but as soon as it was invented, its absurdity was convincingly exposed, and its falsehood irrefragably proved. The register of the see of Canterbury, in which the consecration was recorded, is still extant, and bears all possible marks of authenticity. This register was referred to by Archbishop Parker himself, for another purpose—that of confirming his own consecration, and that of his brethren, by an Act of Parliament, seven years after they had been elevated to their respective sees. The register was again produced by Archbishop Abbot in the reign of James the First; and liberty was granted by that Prelate to some Romanists to peruse and examine the document. Before that time, the fact of the consecration, according to the Ritual of King Edward, was never disputed, but only the validity of the

<sup>k</sup> Bishop Ellys's Tracts on Spiritual and Temporal Liberty, vol. i. Tracts iv. v.

<sup>1</sup> At the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside. "That this lie of a Nag's Head was bred in a knave's brains doth plainly appear; for why should a rich man be a thief? All the churches in the land were open to them." Fuller's Church History, b. ix. Mr. Hallam, in his Constitutional History, observes, that Dr. Lingard does not support the story of the Nag's Head. See Courayer on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English, c. ii. Oxf. 1844.

consecration, supposing it to have been performed according to that Ritual. The evidence from the registers concerning this transaction was confirmed in the reign of James the First, by the testimony of the Earl of Nottingham, who declared in the House of Lords, that he was himself present in Lambeth chapel at the consecration of Archbishop Parker<sup>m</sup>.

When the see of Canterbury had been filled, it was necessary to provide for the Suffragan Bishoprics, but, under existing circumstances, this was a difficult task. The attention of the Queen and her Ministers had been naturally directed to the exiled Divines, who had undergone so many privations for the Protestant faith; but many of them had returned with opinions which at once disinclined and disqualified them for any share in the government of the English Church. They had adopted the principles of the foreign Reformers on civil government and ecclesiastical discipline, and on some points of theological doctrine; but these principles were widely at variance with those of Elizabeth, and the great majority of the English nation. There was also, at this juncture, not only a Genevan, but a Lutheran, party. There were not a few who endeavoured to settle the Church, according to the Confession of Augsburg; while the disciples of Calvin had been trained under a master who exacted implicit deference, and forbade them to resort to any other master for instruction.

In the selection of Parker the Queen had been singularly fortunate; for, by remaining at home, he had been uncontaminated by foreign prejudices, and he lamented, with keen anguish, the change of opinion in his banished friends. But there was scarcely another Divine of eminence placed in a similar situation. Of the five expatriated Bishops, Poinet was dead, and two of the remaining four refused to reassume their episcopal functions. Bale,

<sup>m</sup> Bishop Elly's Tracts on Spiritual and Temporal Liberty, p. 223.

formerly Bishop of Ossory, had been an early convert from the errors of Popery, but by embracing Protestantism, he did not renounce Episcopacy. He accepted a see in Ireland, and was consecrated according to the Ordinal of Edward; but he returned with a different spirit: he thought that he had discovered Episcopacy to be an institution of the seventh century, and an invention of the monks. He therefore chose to retire on a Prebend of Canterbury, and there employed the remainder of his days in composing antipapistical invectives, and sacred comedies<sup>a</sup>. Coverdale, although he consented to assist in the consecration of Parker, yet officiated without his episcopal habit, and ended his days in a state of separation from the Church. Barlow and Seory were restored to the episcopal office, but neither of them was placed in his former Bishopric; and with the exception of these, and Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff, the whole Episcopacy of England was to be renewed.

Of those Divines whose opinions were not changed by exile, and who returned with their former partiality for an episcopal government, Cox was the most distinguished. His resolute maintenance of the English Liturgy, in opposition to the personal opposition of Knox, and the written attack of Calvin, entitled him to a high place in the Church of England, and his merit was not more than adequately rewarded by the Bishopric of Ely. In this station his conduct corresponded with that which he had throughout his life maintained; and in the fierce disputes which arose concerning the habits and other ceremonies of the Church, he appears not to have participated. He rather lamented the decay of practical religion, and the neglect of the word of God, which generally prevailed; and these evils he assiduously laboured to correct.

Grindal was promoted to the important see of London: he had also distinguished himself in the troubles of

<sup>a</sup> Brooks's Lives of the Puritans, p. 101. Lond. 1813.

Frankfort, and had been the coadjutor of Cox. No one more deeply lamented the controversies which had taken place among the Reformers, and no one was better fitted, by the mildness of his temper, to reduce dissentients to conformity. He had been a diligent collector of documents relative to the sufferings of the Protestant martyrs, and Fox received valuable assistance from Grindal in the compilation of his work. If friendship for his companions in exile induced him to connive at their irregularities, and even their total defection from ecclesiastical discipline, yet his lenity and forbearance, originating in such a motive, cannot but be regarded with respect.

Horn, the Dean of Durham in the reign of Edward, who had adhered to Cox during the troubles at Frankfort, and had finally seceded with him from the refractory congregation, was appointed to the see of Winchester; Pilkington, on the removal of Tonstal, succeeded in the Bishopric of Durham; and the sees of Worcester and Rochester were conferred on Sandys and Guest.

And Jewel, "the ornament of his age for learning and piety," the glory of the Reformation, was not forgotten. So high was his reputation, that immediately on his return from exile, he was selected as one of the Protestant Divines in the Conference at Westminster Abbey. After this, he was appointed one of the Commissioners for a General Visitation, and was sent into the western district; and having discharged this important trust, the Queen testified her approbation by his nomination to the Bishopric of Salisbury.

Bishoprics were offered to other eminent Divines, who refused to accept the charge; some from a dislike of the habits and ceremonies prescribed by the Act of Uniformity, others from a disinclination to episcopal government, and from an objection to acknowledge the regal supremacy. Among the recusants are found the names of Whitehead, Knox, and Bernard Gilpin. This last

Divine, often known by the title of the Apostle of the North, was a relative of Tonstal, and was sent by that Prelate to "visit the foreign Churches," during the reign of King Edward. While Gilpin was at Paris, Tonstal requested him to superintend the printing of a work written by himself on the doctrine of Transubstantiation. This doctrine was candidly acknowledged by the Bishop to be a novelty, and he expressed his free censure against Innocent the Third for declaring its belief to be essential to salvation.

When Tonstal was restored by Mary to the see of Durham, of which he had been so unjustly deprived, Gilpin returned to England, and although a zealous anti-papist, rather than a decided Protestant, lived during the Marian persecution, not indeed without hazard, but in the legal possession of a lucrative benefice, and in the unrestrained performance of his pastoral duties. He was indebted for his safety to the general lenity and the particular esteem of Tonstal, his relative and diocesan; and he was more than protected by this truly Catholic Prelate—he was preferred; and in that situation, at Cobham, in which he had been placed by his patron, he chose to pass the remainder of his life<sup>o</sup>.

Curiosity will be naturally directed to the condition of those Prelates, who were deprived for their refusal to acknowledge the regal supremacy, or to conform to the Church, as it was established under Elizabeth. As the name of Bernard Gilpin is so intimately associated with that of Tonstal, it should first be noticed, that both Tonstal and Thirlby were received under the hospitable roof of the Primate, where they lived with freedom and comfort. Heath was solicited by every mode of application to continue in the Archbishopric of York, and the see was kept vacant for two years, in the hope of his conformity; but his pertinacious refusal caused no abate-

<sup>o</sup> Bishop Carleton's Life of Bernard Gilpin, p. 80.

ment in the esteem of the Queen; he lived and died quietly in his own house in Surrey, and was often honoured by a visit from his Sovereign.

The sanguinary Boner, respected by no party, because he had betrayed all, dragged on many years in obscurity, and was confined, though without any severe restraints, in the Marshalsea, and at last died, in the year 1569, with general execration<sup>p</sup>. White and Watson, his companions, but not his equals in cruelty, were at first imprisoned, but were soon restored to liberty, and assigned competent pensions. Brookes, Bishop of Gloucester, died soon after the accession of Elizabeth.

Of the remaining Prelates, three quitted the kingdom, and the rest were consigned, either to the custody of their friends, or of some Protestant Bishop. The Abbey of Westminster was again converted into a Deanery and College; and Fecknam, its late Abbot, “a charitable and generous man, lived in a private station with universal esteem<sup>q</sup>.” The religious houses being dissolved, most of the Monks returned to a secular life; but the Nuns withdrew themselves into foreign countries.

## CHAPTER XVI.

Royal Visitation and Injunctions.—Articles of Religion agreed on by the Archbishop and Bishops till the Meeting of Convocation.—Jewel’s Sermon at Saint Paul’s Cross.—Conduct of the Popes Paul IV. and Pius IV.—Second Parliament of Elizabeth.—Statute of Assurance.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.—Proceedings of the Lower House with regard to Ceremonies.—Nowell’s Catechism.—Jewel’s Apology.—Genevan Bible.—Bishops’ Bible.

THE Act of Supremacy having empowered the Queen to establish the Court of High Commission, it was soon

<sup>p</sup> Godwin de Præs. p. 192.

<sup>q</sup> Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. iii. p. 794.

organized, and a royal Visitation was instituted throughout England. To direct the inquiries of the Commissioners, a body of Injunctions was prepared, having some points of resemblance, but many more of difference, to the Injunctions of King Edward.

In the celebration of Divine Worship it was ordered, that the science of Church music should be preserved, and that all lands settled for the maintenance of choirs should be appropriated to that purpose. A caution was given, that an affectation of skill in singing should not be carried so far as to make the use of the Church Service less significant; but that the Common Prayer should be sung or chanted so distinctly that the words might not be lost. For the satisfaction of those who had a predilection for sacred music, an anthem was allowed at the beginning or end of the Service. [Art. 49.] In pursuance of this Injunction, the psalms were sung in a plain manner in most parish churches; but in cathedrals, and in the royal chapel, the choral service with its accompaniment of an organ was uniformly practised, and the cultivation of sacred music was encouraged.

The customary marks of reverence, during the performance of Divine Service, were still to be observed. In the time of reading the Litany, and other Collects, all the people were commanded to kneel; and when the name of Jesus was at any time pronounced, all persons were to bow the head, or to shew some suitable mark of reverence. One of the Injunctions directed that no altar should be taken down, but under the inspection of the Minister and Churchwardens; and at the end of the Injunctions, an order was given to the same effect, with a clause subjoined, that, except on account of uniformity, it seemed to be a matter of no moment whether altars or tables were used, so that the Sacrament were duly and reverently administered.

There was another article deserving of notice, as not

being strictly of a religious nature, that which imposed a restraint on the liberty of the press. No book or pamphlet was permitted to be printed or published without a licence from the Queen, or six of her Privy Council, or her Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, the Chancellors of both Universities, the Bishop of the diocese being Ordinary, and the Archdeacon of the place where any such book was printed. But from the operation of this rule all ancient and profane authors were excepted.

An explanation was also given concerning the Oath of Supremacy which had been misconstrued by some, as if the Kings or Queens of England had claimed an authority or power to administer Divine Service in the church. In this sense, the supremacy was disclaimed; and no other ecclesiastical power was challenged, than such as had been exercised by Henry the Eighth, and Edward the Sixth, "and was of ancient time due to the imperial Crown of the realm." This power was, "under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons" within the realm of England, "both ecclesiastical and temporal, so as no foreign power might have any superiority over them."

The review of the Common Prayer, the omission of the deprecation against the Pope in the Litany, the re-establishment of some part of King Edward's First Service Book, the decency of the sacerdotal habits, and the solemnity with which Divine Service was by the Injunctions commanded to be performed, reconciled a great part of the laity of the Romish Church. It is a fact beyond reasonable doubt, that, for the first ten years of the reign of Elizabeth, the principal persons of the Romish Communion resorted ordinarily to church without scruple or dissatisfaction<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>r</sup> The authorities to prove this fact are too numerous for reference; one therefore is sufficient, and that is the strongest. The fact was

The more violent part of the Romanists, as it might be expected, aimed at a recognition of the Papal supremacy ; and the deprivation of the Romish Bishops occasioned remonstrances from foreign Princes. The Queen was solicited by certain Roman Catholic Princes to grant more than a toleration; to allow a partial establishment of Popery, and grant some churches in large cities to her subjects of that persuasion. But her answer was decisive ;— that the deprived Bishops had disobeyed the laws, and disturbed the peace of the kingdom ; that some of them had refused compliance with that doctrine to which they had themselves conformed in the reign of her father and brother; and that to grant them churches, for the purpose of keeping up a distinct Communion, was contrary to the public interest and her own conscience<sup>s</sup>.

Not only foreign interference was employed, but the deprived Bishops addressed a remonstrance to the Queen, exhorting her to return to the old Communion. They reminded her that Christianity was planted in England by the Church of Rome, and implored her to recollect the acknowledged supremacy of its Bishop. The address, containing some reflections on the conduct of her father and brother, Elizabeth retorted on the subscribing Prelates<sup>t</sup> with severe personality, and denied the fact that Christianity was originally propagated in England by missionaries from Rome.

Though the Act of Supremacy had conferred on the Queen an absolute power in the Church ; and though the Act of Uniformity had shewn that Parliament exercised a right of prescribing the form of national worship ; yet a confession of faith was not deemed to be within the

averred by the Queen, in her instructions to Sir Francis Walsingham, dated August 11, 1570.

<sup>s</sup> Camden's Elizabeth, p. 20.

<sup>t</sup> The address was subscribed by Heath, Boner, Bourn, Turberville, and Pool.

province of either Royal or Parliamentary authority. This was thought to belong peculiarly to the two Houses of Convocation, and therefore until that body should reassemble, a short profession of doctrine was agreed on by the Archbishop and Bishops. All Incumbents, before admission to any benefice, were obliged to signify their assent to it, and after admission, to read it twice every year in their churches, for the instruction of the people<sup>u</sup>.

The Articles were ten in number, and contained : 1. An acknowledgment of the Trinity ; 2. a profession of belief in the canonical Scriptures, and of the three Creeds ; 3. a definition of the nature and authority of the Church ; 4. a declaration of the authority of the Ministerial office ; 5. an acknowledgment of the Regal Supremacy ; 6. a renunciation of the Papal Jurisdiction ; 7. a declaration that the Book of Common Prayer is agreeable to the Scriptures ; 8. an admission that the disuse of oil and other superstitious ceremonies in Baptism does not take away the validity of that Sacrament ; 9. a rejection of private Masses, and of the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass ; 10. an assent to the practice of administering the Communion in both kinds. To these ten Articles, another was added, disallowing the extolling of images, relics, and feigned miracles, and all modes of expressing the invisible God in a bodily form ; all pilgrimages, praying upon beads, and similar superstitions. This last Article was in the form of a declaration by the assenting ecclesiastic, and contained an acknowledgment that such assent was given without compulsion, with freedom of mind and conscience, and on a sure persuasion that the Articles were true, and agreeable to the word of God.

This declaration of faith is a demonstration that the Reformers under Elizabeth, while they conducted their opposition to the Church of Rome with prudence and temper, never sacrificed any Protestant principle, nor

<sup>u</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. iii. Coll. Rec. no. 11.

abandoned any Protestant doctrine. They never conceded that the points of difference between the Churches of England and Rome were unimportant; and, on the other hand, they never maintained that it was impossible to recede too far from the doctrines and worship of the Romish Church. Because the pretended supremacy of the Pope was unscriptural, they did not draw the absurd conclusion that Episcopacy was one of the corruptions of Popery; because superstitions and errors had found their way into the Missal, they did not infer that a Liturgy was unlawful. They concluded that they were bound to reform all which was contrary to the common and avowed standard of appeal, the Word of God, but to reform nothing more.

That no compromise was intended with the Church of Rome is evident, if proof were wanted, from the conduct of the most influential Prelate in the English Church, Bishop Jewel. At this crisis he delivered his celebrated sermon at Saint Paul's cross, in which twenty-seven points of doctrine, maintained by the Church of Rome, were distinctly enumerated, and, at the end of each, a challenge was given by the preacher to any antagonist who would defend its truth. The challenge was conveyed in these memorable words: "*If any learned man of our adversaries, or all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor or Father, or General Council, or holy Scripture, or any one example in the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly proved, during the first six hundred years, then I shall be content to yield and subscribe.*" The twenty-seven Articles related to those two fundamental errors, formerly marked out by Ridley as the source of all others; the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, and the sacrifice of the Mass. Two only of the Articles cannot be comprised under these heads, that on the celebration of divine worship in an unknown tongue, and that which asserts ignorance to be the mother of devotion.

The challenge of Jewel having been thus proclaimed

before so large an auditory, startled the English papists, both at home and abroad, and among the last, such of the English fugitives as had retired to Louvain, Douay, or Saint Omer. “ The controversy occasioned by it was first discussed in a series of friendly letters between Jewel and Cole, the late Dean of Saint Paul's; then more violently agitated in a book by Rastal, who first appeared in the lists against the challenger; followed herein by Dorman and Marshal, who were successively vanquished by Nowell and Calfhill; but these were only skirmishes preparatory to the main encounter between the challenger himself and John Harding, one of the Divines of Louvain, and the most learned of that College. The combatants were both born in Devonshire, educated at Barnstaple school, and had studied at Oxford. Both were zealous Protestants in the time of King Edward, and both relapsed into popery in the time of Queen Mary; Jewel through fear of death, and Harding on hope of preferment; but the fall of Jewel may be compared to that of Saint Peter, short, sudden, and rising greater from his fall; while that of Harding was like that of Judas, premeditated and irrecoverable. Which of the combatants had the advantage in this contest will easily appear to any one who consults their writings. The learned answers of Jewel contain such a magazine of all sorts of learning, that future writers have thence “ furnished themselves with arguments and authority\*.”

The Pope was constantly advertised of the progress of the English Reformation, and when he too late perceived that his extravagant pretensions to dispose of the Crown were treated with scorn, he became more moderate in his demands; he only insisted, that there should be no change in religion. But when he found that his interference in the settlement of the Church was rejected, he joined in the intrigues of the French Court, and strenuously sup-

\* Heylin's Eccles. Restaur. p. 301.

ported the title of the Queen of Scotland to the sovereignty of England.

But the death of the Pontiff changed the policy of the Court of Rome. Pius the Fourth, of the Medicean 1559 family, possessed a large share of its dexterity in negociation, and of its flexibility of conduct to circumstances. He wisely considered, that to use threats, without any power of putting them into execution, was a mark always of folly, and often of cowardice. He knew that the imperious demands of his predecessor had stimulated Elizabeth to proceed with more vigour in the Reformation, and he resolved to try whether she might not be gained by some concessions and many specious professions of friendship. For this end, he despatched Parpalia to England with a letter to the Queen, and instructions for his conduct; the letter is well known, the instructions are matter of conjecture. The epistle began with the customary apostolical benediction, and with solemn protestations of affectionate concern for the Queen; “ how great that concern was, would be fully explained by his nuncio. He exhorted her to dismiss her evil advisers from her councils, and to resign herself to the admonitions of himself, her spiritual father. She might then assure herself of receiving from him any compliance consistent with the dignity of his station, not only with reference to her spiritual advantage, but to the service and security of her royal dignity.” What might be the nature of Parpalia’s instructions is not certain; but common report at this time affirmed, that the Pope had engaged to sanction the English Liturgy; to permit that the Holy Communion might be administered to the laity in both kinds; and to reverse the sentence which had passed in the Consistory against the validity of her mother’s marriage; and that these concessions were offered on condition, that the

7 Camden’s Elizabeth, p. 34.

Queen would return to the Romish communion, and acknowledge the primacy of the Pope<sup>z</sup>.

But this application had no effect on Elizabeth and her counsellors; she was advised by Cecil not to rest her title to the Crown on her descent, but on the testament of her father, ratified by the authority of Parliament. For her security against the pretensions of the Queen of Scotland, she relied more on the treaty at Edinburgh, concluded by her own ambassadors, than on any Bull of the Vatican. When this treaty was violated by the Scottish Queen, supported by the Court of France, the Pope once more attempted to gain the Queen of England. He despatched Martinengo to England, inviting her to participate in the Council of Trent, and assuring her that either her Ambassadors or her Bishops should experience a most honourable reception.

Whatever dangers menaced the security of her government, either from foreign hostilities, or from domestic rebellion, Elizabeth firmly refused to govern her kingdom by the aid of the Pope. Instead of acceding to the invitation, the Council, after a long deliberation, resolved, that the papal Nuncio should not be permitted to land on the English shore. To receive a person under this character, implied an acknowledgment of the papal supremacy, and it was forcibly argued, that the Popes always turned the slightest concessions to their advantage. It was therefore most prudent to refuse all intercourse with the See of Rome, and to keep at the most remote distance. The report that a Nuncio was coming into England had emboldened the papists not only to break the laws, but to spread a report, that the Queen was about to change her religion. In Ireland the Pope's Legate had abetted the rebellion, and pronounced against the Queen's title to the Crown, and there was no security against the same conduct in England<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>z</sup> Heylin's Eccl. Rest. p. 304.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid.

The second Parliament of Elizabeth was intended to confirm and complete the ecclesiastical polity of England; and the Convocation was designed to model those parts which were foreign to parliamentary cognizance. The Parliament enacted a Statute for the assurance of the Queen's regal power over all estates and subjects within her dominions. It was an extension of the Act of Supremacy, and was pointed against those who maintained the "jurisdiction of the See of Rome unjustly claimed and usurped within the realm." The Oath of Supremacy was to be taken not only by all ecclesiastics, but by the House of Commons, by all common lawyers and all schoolmasters. To write, preach, print, teach, or in any other manner to maintain the authority of the Pope within the kingdom of England, subjected the offender to the penalties of a *præmunire* for the first offence, and of high treason for the second.

The Bill was strongly opposed in the House of Lords by Viscount Montague, and in the House of Commons by Atkinson. The arguments of the latter were not without effect, and those of Montague procured the insertion of a clause, releasing every Peer from taking the oath<sup>b</sup>. The Archbishop of Canterbury also, by the Queen's order, enjoined the Bishops not to tender the oath unless in a case of necessity, and never to press it a second time without his special direction. But he desired that these suggestions might not be interpreted as if he were a favourer of obstinate recusants. "But only in respect of a fatherly and pastoral care, which must appear in us, which be heads of His flocks, not to follow our private affection and hearts, but to provide *coram Deo et hominibus*, for saving and winning of others, if it may be so obtained<sup>c</sup>."

The Convocation, in which the Articles of the Church of England and the standard of doctrine were finally settled,

<sup>b</sup> Stat. 5 Elizabeth, c. 1. §. xvii.

<sup>c</sup> Strype's Life of Abp. Parker.

was opened at Saint Paul's on the day following the meeting of Parliament. Day, the Provost of Eton, preached the sermon, and the Archbishop, in his address, informed the Clergy, that they had now an opportunity of reforming all ecclesiastical abuses and corruptions: he added, that the Queen and the nobility were equally desirous of such a reformation. He then dismissed the Lower House to choose its Prolocutor, and they elected Alexander Nowell, lately made Dean of Saint Paul's, to fill that honourable place.

The Queen having granted a licence to the Convocation to review the doctrine and discipline of the Church, its doctrines were first taken into consideration, and the Convocation proceeded with the Articles as the Parliament had proceeded with the Liturgy. They took the Articles of King Edward as the basis of the English Confession, and made such alterations as the existing state of Christendom demanded. The alterations are neither few nor unimportant, and, where they are capable of historical illustration, will necessarily require explanation. If the records of the Convocation had been preserved, it would have been easy to trace the variations between the Articles of Edward and Elizabeth to their right source; but their cause must now be left to conjecture, in some cases probable, but never amounting to certainty. Some of the alterations, doubtless, must have originated in a change of opinion, and others in a change of circumstances. The extinction of old errors, or the introduction of new, must have rendered it expedient to soften certain Articles, and to give a more determinate mode of expression to others.

An appeal to the private sentiments of the Reformers is not the safest method of ascertaining the grammatical construction or fixing the doubtful sense of a particular Article; but it is an infallible criterion of the spirit and tendency of the whole Confession. It is right, therefore,

to state the characters of those who were engaged in the revival of the Articles, and the circumstances in which the Reformers were placed.

It has been already mentioned, that the Articles of Edward were the work of Cranmer and Ridley; the Articles of Elizabeth were framed by Parker, aided principally by Jewel. The Articles of Edward were drawn up, as it has been seen, when the Council of Trent was renewed under Julius the Third [1522]; the Articles of Elizabeth were published, when, after a long intermission, the Tridentine Council re-assembled under the pontificate of Pius the Fourth. [1562.] The Reformers of Edward were too intimately connected with the foreign Protestant Churches to receive an invitation to assist in its deliberations; but Elizabeth, who followed the example of her father, experienced greater courtesy; and not only a papal Nuncio was sent to solicit her attendance, but a personal solicitation was sent to Jewel. After the refusal of Elizabeth's Council to suffer Martinengo to come into the kingdom, Scipio, a noble Venetian, a friend of Jewel, at Padua, laboured by a private application to gain that point, which the Nuncio could not gain as a public minister. Scipio expostulated with Jewel on the singular conduct of the English nation, in taking no notice of the Council of Trent, by neither sending representatives, nor excusing their absence; that it argued pride as well as schism not to appear at the Council on the summons of the Pope; that at Trent was assembled the learning of Christendom, and the piety of the Catholic Church; and that to adjust religious differences, as the English were about to settle them, was an attempt equally impious and fruitless.

Jewel, in his reply, disclaimed any participation in the late resolution of the English Government of refusing to receive the Nuncio; but freely delivered his sentiments on the propriety of that refusal. The English was not the

only nation which refused to appear at the Council of Trent, for the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria declined to come; and in Europe the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark, many of the Germanic States, and of the Swiss Republics, had no representatives. Having defended the nation from the charge of singularity, he proved that its refusal was justified by the most cogent reasons. The ancient Fathers always declined to appear at Councils which were notoriously partial and prejudiced; and Jewel, after having adduced many instances, applied them to the case in point. He expressed his surprise that the Pope should summon the English to the Council, who had been pronounced heretics by his predecessor. In what character could they appear? Why must they take so long a journey to plead as criminals? They could expect only the alternative of being obliged to recant, or of incurring the anathema of the Council<sup>d</sup>.

With this recorded protestation of Jewel against the authority of the Council of Trent,—with the indisputable fact, that he was principally concerned in forming the Articles of Elizabeth, it is impossible to suppose that there was any disposition in the Church of England to homology with the Church of Rome. Whatever conciliation might be shewn to the Romanists in the revisal of the Liturgy, there was no concession of a single point of doctrine.

Thus the Article of Elizabeth, “On the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation,” [Art. 6.] more directly opposes the Council of Trent, than the correspondent Article of Edward. [Art. 5.] Both Articles affirm, that the Scriptures are a complete rule of faith, and that the Christian religion is contained in them, and in them alone; but the Article of Elizabeth distinguishes the

<sup>d</sup> Epist. Jewel. It is inserted at the end of the History of the Council of Trent, by Sleidan; and also bound up with his Apology, in an edition printed in 1685.

Canonical Books of Scripture from the Apocryphal, and the books belonging to each class are enumerated. The Council of Trent has declared the Canonical and Apocryphal Books of Scripture to be of equal authority, and to reduce them to a more palpable equality, the Romanists have intermingled them in their editions of the Old Testament. The English Church, on the contrary, has classified the Books of Scripture under the respective divisions of Canonical and Apocryphal, and has affirmed of the latter, that they are to be read “for example of life and instruction of manners,” but not to be applied “to establish any doctrine.”

All the Articles of Edward<sup>e</sup>, levelled against the errors of the Church of Rome, such as that of *Purgatory*, of *Works of Supererogation*, of *performing Divine Service in an unknown tongue*, of *the nature and number of the Sacraments*, have been retained in the Articles of Elizabeth. The only Article which has been selected to shew that the Reformers, on their revisal of Edward’s Articles, abated the terms of communion in favour of the Papists, is that on *the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*. It has been alleged, that the Article was mutilated to bring the Romanists into the communion of the Church; that an express definition against the real presence was thought to be offensive to many of that persuasion; and therefore it was deemed sufficient to condemn Transubstantiation, and to affirm that Christ was present after a spiritual manner, and received by faith<sup>f</sup>.

If the Reformers of Elizabeth, in their abridgment of this Article, were actuated by such an intention, they were not guided by their usual soundness of judgment: but that they had any such intention may be safely denied. The metaphysical argument of the impossibility that a

<sup>e</sup> See Bp. Sparrow’s Coll.

<sup>f</sup> Burnet’s Hist. Ref. vol. ii. b. iii. p. 812. This he calls the *secret* of the omission.

human body should “be at one and the same time in many places,” is by no means the strongest argument against Transubstantiation. Metaphysical arguments might be applied with equal success to disprove any of the mysterious doctrines of Christianity. Why is Transubstantiation rejected, and the Trinity retained by the Church of England? Not because the doctrine of the Trinity is within the reach of human comprehension, but because it is deducible “from the plain words of Scripture;” because it has been the belief of the primitive Church, and because it is consistent with the scheme of human redemption. All these arguments Transubstantiation wants. It is “repugnant to the plain words of Scripture;” it “overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament;” it cannot be proved to have been the belief of the Christian Church for the first nine centuries, and it “hath given occasion to many superstitions.” These arguments the Article retains; to have urged more would have been undoubtedly superfluous; and to have omitted the weakest cannot be interpreted into a disposition to temporize. If this omission were one of those things which drove the ancient Puritans out of the Established Church<sup>s</sup>, it only proves their want of judgment, or their want of charity.

That no undue concession to the Romanists was intended is evident, from the circumstance that all the other Articles of Edward were retained which are inconsistent with Transubstantiation. To affirm that the wicked do not receive Christ’s Body and Blood, [Art. 29.] is the same thing with denying that Christ is corporally present in the Sacrament. To affirm that both parts of the Sacrament are “to be ministered to all Christian men alike,” [Art. 30.] is to deny the Romish doctrine of Concomitance, which is built on that of the corporal presence. To affirm that the one oblation of Christ is a perfect

<sup>s</sup> Confessional, c. iv. note, p. 245. vol. v. Works of F. Blackburne, M.A. Camb. 1805.

satisfaction for sin, [Art. 31.] is to deny the sacrifice in the Mass, and the use of private Masses, which cannot subsist without Transubstantiation.

Having thus considered the Articles of Elizabeth in reference to the Church of Rome, there are some other alterations which relate to controversies subsisting among Protestants.

In the Article of Edward, entitled, "*Of the going down of Christ into Hell,*" a determinate sense was annexed to this fundamental tenet of the Creed: it was added, 'for the Body lay in the sepulchre until the Resurrection; but His Ghost departing from Him, was with the ghosts that were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testifie.' The Reformers of Elizabeth, whatever might be their private interpretation of this Article, avoided any authoritative explanation in an Article of faith, and were satisfied simply to quote the words of the Apostles' Creed, without affixing to them a literal or a figurative meaning.

A similar latitude of opinion was left by the Reformers of Elizabeth on certain points, which the Articles of Edward had decided in peremptory terms. The four last Articles of Edward—"1. *That the resurrection of the dead is not yet brought to pass;* 2. *That the souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies, nor sleep idly;* 3. *On Hereticks called Millenarii;* 4. *All men shall not be saved at the length*"—were omitted by the Reformers of Elizabeth. The reason of the omission was not that a decided change in opinion had taken place with respect to these points; but they either related to errors which, as they had been exploded, it was needless formally to condemn; or to questions on which difference of opinion might safely exist, and which ought to be left to private judgment.

The Articles of Elizabeth, considered with respect to the controversies among Protestants, enlarged the terms of communion, by their omissions of many points of

doubtful disputation. The additions which they contain are not on points of a controversial nature; but it is necessary to advert to the enlargement of two Articles, though on subjects widely different.

The twentieth Article, "On the Authority of the Church," is chiefly remarkable, because it has given rise to a charge of interpolation. In its present form it consists of two parts, the first asserting a power in the Church to decree rites and ceremonies, and to judge in matters of faith; the second limiting this power, and submitting it to the rule of Scripture: but it has been disputed whether the first clause was originally a part of the Article as drawn up by the Reformers of Elizabeth. That the clause is not to be found in the corresponding Article of Edward proves nothing against its genuineness: the strongest argument for its interpolation is its omission in the two manuscripts of the Articles preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, in the University of Cambridge. But that these manuscripts are originals is a point which remains to be proved, and it is certain that the questionable clause occurs in the earliest printed edition of the Articles. The records of the Convocation being destroyed, it is impossible now to appeal to an evidence which would be conclusive; but in the time of Archbishop Laud these records were in existence, and when examined by him the clause was found, and they were afterwards inspected by Heylin, who confirms the testimony of Laud. Fuller declares that he is unable to decide the question; but Fuller is not superior to Heylin in candour, and far below him in accuracy. Besides, it is not certain that Fuller had the same privilege of perusing the records of Convocation with Laud and Heylin. The diligent and impartial researches of Strype ended in favour of the genuineness of the clause. The question is now purely one of literary curiosity, because the Article with the disputed clause was afterwards confirmed by Parliament<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>h</sup> Including the authority of Convocation.

The thirty-fifth Article relates to the Homilies. When the Articles of Edward were compiled, there was but a single book, consisting only of twelve; but at the end there was an announcement that more were to follow<sup>i</sup>. Another book was completed about the time of Edward's death, but was not published. The common error must therefore be corrected, that the Second Book of Homilies was the work of Elizabeth's reign, and that Jewel was its principal composer: whereas it was the work of Edward's reign, and must be attributed to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. In the thirty-fifth Article, the titles of the Second Book of Homilies are enumerated, and one historical observation must not be forgotten. The last Homily, against Rebellion, was not composed till some years after the Articles had been confirmed by Parliament, and it was then added to the others. From the Homily itself, and from the prayer at its conclusion, it appears to have been penned after the rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, at a time when the nation was suffering under a civil war.

After repeating that the design of this work does not embrace an exposition of the Articles, and that the observations already offered have an historical reference, it remains to be observed, that the Articles were concluded, and the subscription finished, in the Chapter-house of Saint Paul's, in the ninth Session of the Convocation<sup>k</sup>. All the Bishops of the province of Canterbury subscribed, except those of Gloucester and Rochester, who were absent, and of the Lower House there were above one hundred names. Among the subscribers were several of the learned exiles, who were afterwards conspicuous in the ranks of nonconformity.

The next subject which came under the consideration of the Convocation were the rites and ceremonies of the

<sup>i</sup> Hereafter shall follow sermons of fasting, prayer, almsdeeds, &c. Postscript to the First Book of Homilies, p. 146. 8vo. Oxford edit. 1822.

<sup>k</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. i. c. xxviii. p. 484.

Church. Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, moved, that a Paper of Advice might be presented to the Queen on the following points: that private baptism, and baptism by women, might be taken out of the Common Prayer Book; that the cross in baptism might be disallowed as needless and superstitious; and that Commissioners might be appointed to reform the ecclesiastical laws<sup>1</sup>.

Another paper was afterwards presented to the House with the following articles of petition, subscribed by thirty-three names; that the Psalms might be sung distinctly by the whole congregation, and that organs might be laid aside; that none of the laity might be allowed to baptize, and that the use of the cross might be discontinued in the Sacrament of Baptism; that kneeling at the Eucharist might be left at the discretion of the Ordinary; that the use of copes and surplices might be discontinued; that the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments might not be compelled to use such habits as the enemies of Christ's Gospel have chosen to be the special array of their priesthood; that the clause in the thirty-fourth Article, which censured such as did not conform to the public order, might be mitigated; and that all festivals kept in honour of the saints might be abrogated, or at least commemorated only in sermons, homilies, or prayers illustrative of their history, and that, after having attended public service on those days, the people might be allowed to work.

This paper being disapproved, another, containing a modification of the preceding Articles, was brought into the Lower House. It went to abrogate all festivals, except Sundays and principal feasts in honour of Christ: it recommended, that in reading Divine Service the Minister should turn his face towards the people, that the people might hear and be edified: it allowed the use of the sur-

<sup>1</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. pp. 361, 362. Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. pp. 149, 150.

pliance in reading prayers, and only abolished the cope and the other sacerdotal vestments.

These Articles were warmly contested in the Lower House; and some of the Members were willing to refer the controversy to the decision of the Prelates. Others protested against such a compromise, and declared a resolution to resist any innovation on the Book of Common Prayer, and on the rules, rites, and ceremonies prescribed by it. When the question was put to the vote, it appears that the innovators formed a considerable part of the assembly, and that the English exiles had brought back a predilection for the discipline of the foreign Churches. On a scrutiny, the approvers of the propositions who were present exceeded the other party by a majority of eight<sup>m</sup>; but when the proxies were counted, the scale was turned, and the propositions were rejected by a majority of one. The Prolocutor, Nowell, divided with the favourers of the innovations. It is not to be supposed that, if the affirmative vote had been carried, the alterations would have taken place: it might have been followed by an address from the Lower House of Convocation to the Queen, and there the matter would have terminated<sup>n</sup>.

This contest in the Lower House impeded the business of Convocation during several days; and after a subsidy had been granted, a Book of Discipline was brought to the Upper House by the Prolocutor of the Lower, accompanied by ten other members. The book was referred to the Archbishop, and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Chichester, Hereford, and Ely. The Prolocutor then brought up some additional Articles relating to discipline, and the Archbishop delivered to him the former book to be reconsidered. What this Book of Discipline was does

<sup>m</sup> Forty-three to thirty-five, present, in favour of innovation; fifty-nine to fifty-eight, including proxies, in favour of the established order. Neal's Hist. of the Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 151.

<sup>n</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. vol. iii. b. vi. p. 582.

not clearly appear, for the Convocation was prorogued before the book was confirmed.

In this Convocation, a Latin Catechism on a more comprehensive plan than that of Edward the Sixth, and intended for the use of schools, was composed by the Prolocutor, Alexander Nowell. He engaged in the undertaking by the advice of Cecil, to whom the work was dedicated ; and it being submitted to the Lower House of Convocation, that assembly gave to the performance of its president the sanction of its approbation. But there is no evidence that the Catechism was submitted to the Upper House of Convocation, and it never obtained a place among the authorized formularies of the Church. The statement is erroneous, that the Catechism of Nowell was reviewed and sanctioned by the same Convocation which reviewed and sanctioned the Articles<sup>o</sup>; and it is not partially but totally erroneous. The Articles were reviewed by the Archbishops and Bishops alone ; and it does not appear that they were submitted to the Lower House, except for the purpose of being subscribed. The Catechism was composed by the Prolocutor of the Lower House at the solicitation of Cecil : it was reviewed and corrected by that House ; but was never sanctioned, or, perhaps, even revised by the Prelates. Whatever may be its merit, it has no other weight than that which it derives from the deserved reputation of its author, and from the suffrages of other names of high estimation. These testimonies it undoubtedly possesses ; and among them the encomium of Whitgift is not the least valuable, that there is no one so well instructed who may not derive benefit from the repeated perusal of so learned and necessary a book.

What Nowell's Catechism has been inaccurately represented to be, that Jewel's Apology really is, an accredited and public confession of the Catholic and Christian faith of

<sup>o</sup> Daubeny's *Vindiciae*, p. 113. Lond. 1803.

the Church of England. It is not to be considered as the unauthorized work of an eminent Prelate; but as an authentic exposition of the doctrines of that Church whose name it bears. It was published by the express command of the Queen, and at the royal expense; and it expressed with such fidelity and force the sentiments of the English hierarchy, that Parker designed it as an accompaniment to the Articles.

The design of the Apology is twofold: first, to state the reasons of the separation of the English Church from that of Rome; and, secondly, to answer the calumnies which, on account of that separation, had been raised against the English nation. Like the Articles, it appeared during the last meeting of the Council of Trent, and its seasonable publication excited a general attention to its arguments. The character which the biographer of Jewel has given of the Apology cannot be expressed better than in his own language. “It is so drawn, that the first part of the work is an illustration, and, as it were, a paraphrase, of the twelve Articles of the Christian Faith contained in the Creed; the second is a short and solid confutation of whatever is objected against the Church. If the arrangement be considered, nothing can be better distributed; if the perspicuity, nothing can be more clear; if the style, nothing can be more terse; if the diction, nothing can be more splendid; if the arguments, nothing can be stronger.”<sup>p</sup>

The Apology was composed by its author in the Latin language, of which he was a complete master; but it was soon translated into the German, Italian, French, Spanish, Dutch, and even into the Welsh tongue. There was also a Greek version; and that it might obtain a popular circulation, it was translated into English by Lady Bacon, wife of the Lord Keeper, and a daughter of Sir Anthony Cook.

<sup>p</sup> Joan. Juelli Angl. Vita et Mors, Laur. Humfredo, Lond. 1573.

Among the testimonies of approbation received by Jewel, none could be so gratifying as that of Peter Martyr. The connexion between these two eminent divines began with the early youth of Jewel, and it was terminated only by the death of Martyr. But the foreign professor lived to read the immortal work of his once favourite pupil, and to stamp on it the seal of his testamentary commendation. Before his death, in Nov. 1562, he was enabled to transmit not only his own heartfelt commendations, but the approving sentence of the foreign Reformers. "It hath not only given me an entire satisfaction, who approve and am strangely pleased with all you do," was the affectionate congratulation of Martyr, on reading the production of that genius which he had fostered and formed; but the praises of Bullinger, of Gualter, and of Wolfius, not being dictated by partiality for the author, were an evidence of the merit of the work. "You have," continued Martyr, "by this your most elegant and learned Apology, raised such a hope in the minds of all good and learned men, that they generally promise themselves, that whilst you live, the reformed religion shall never want an advocate against its Enemies. And truly I am extreamly glad that I am so happy as to live to see the day which made you the Father of so illustrious and eloquent a Production. May the God of Heaven, of His goodness, grant that you may be blessed in time with many more such<sup>a</sup>!"

After the revisal of the Liturgy and of the Articles, and after the Apologetical Confession of Jewel, it remained to provide for general use a more correct version of the Holy Scriptures. This pious task had been the employment and the solace of the exiles at Geneva; and the Divines who were engaged in it were contented to prolong the period of their banishment from their native country, in

<sup>a</sup> Peter Martyr's Letter, in the Life of Jewel, prefixed to his *Apology*, Lond. 1685.

order that they might witness its completion<sup>r</sup>. The Genevan translators compared the old English Bible of Tindal, first with the Hebrew original, and then with the best modern translations ; they divided the chapters into verses, which former translators had not done ; and, lastly, they added figures, maps, tables, and annotations. It was published at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, with a dedication to the Queen, and an epistle to the reader.

As soon as the translation circulated in England, the dedication and the notes occasioned great dissatisfaction. In the dedication, and the prefatory epistle, the discipline and ceremonies of the Church of England were severely reprehended, as being no better than remnants of Popery. The notes were still more offensive ; for some of them were thought derogatory to the royal prerogative, and others were pointed against episcopacy<sup>s</sup>. The Genevan translation, so far from finding a favourable reception with the Church of England, was not, for many years, suffered to be reprinted by public authority. Until an authorized translation could be completed, the old translation of Tindal and Coverdale was reprinted for general use. The Bishops were directed to undertake a new version, which, though not finished for some years afterwards, was begun at this time. At this period, therefore, a short account of the Bishops' Bible will be inserted with propriety.

Parker, whose proficiency in antiquarian learning had been singularly useful in reforming the Calendar, and in arranging suitable Lessons for the Sundays and Holidays,

<sup>r</sup> The Divines engaged in it were Knox, Coverdale, Goodman, Gibbs, Samson, William Cole, and Whittingham. It was first printed in 1560.

<sup>s</sup> The note on Revelation, ix. 3. was against the episcopal order, where the locusts that come out of the smoke are said to be heretics, false teachers, worldly subtle prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, doctors, bachelors, and masters.

had the chief direction of the new translation. It was his province to divide the Old and New Testaments into portions, and to assign a separate portion to the different translators. Though not exclusively, yet it was principally the work of the English Bishops; and the Bishops of London, Ely, Norwich, Lichfield, Chichester, Worcester, Winchester, and Saint David's, are recorded as the chief agents. When it was published, it had a preface by Parker, and the initial letters of every translator's name were subjoined to his respective portion. The Bishops' Bible was used in the public service of the Church nearly forty years, while the Genevan Bible, being more accordant to the opinions which were acquiring strength, was chiefly read in private<sup>u</sup>.

Such was the settlement of the ecclesiastical polity under the wise counsels of Elizabeth, displaying throughout its progressive steps "the moderation of the Church of England." It preserved an equal distance from Rome and Geneva, and thus secured stability and permanence. By retaining the episcopal form of church government, and the primitive Liturgy, Elizabeth, according to her most virulent enemy, gave strength and perpetuity to the English schism<sup>x</sup>. The moderate and reasonable members of the Romish communion were conciliated by the prudence of the Queen, and the earliest divisions of her reign originated in a different source, in clamours raised by unquiet spirits, not for essentials, but for matters confessedly indifferent. These divisions it is the painful duty of the historian to relate, and their fatal effects on the peace of the Church and of the civil government.

■ Bishop Gray's Key to the Old Testament, Introduction.

<sup>x</sup> Sanders de Schism. Ang.

## CHAPTER XVII.

Origin and progress of Puritanism.—Cecil's Address to the Queen.—Many of the Clergy refuse to wear the Habits.—Case of Samson and Humfreys.—Their correspondence with the foreign Reformers.—Puritans take advantage of a Papal Bull to the University of Cambridge, and are licensed as Preachers.—First separation of the Puritans from the Church.—Conduct of the See of Rome.—Rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.—Bull of Pius the Fifth.—Increase of Puritanism.—Thomas Cartwright.—Parliament and Convocation meet.—Proceedings in both.—Jewel's Sermon at Saint Paul's Cross against the Puritans.—Death of Jewel.

THE origin of Puritanism is traced to the divisions between those English Protestants, who, to save their lives from the tyranny of Mary, found an asylum in Germany; some of the exiles adhering to the Liturgy of King Edward as the religion of their own country, and others imitating the forms of those Churches among whom they lived. Germany, then, must be denominated the birth-place and the cradle of English Puritanism; for it would be a dereliction of candour to seek any extraction more ignoble than that which its followers have assumed, and in which they have always gloried. The name of Puritans, derived from the Puritani or Cathari of the third century, was first imposed as a term of reproach on the English sectarians of the sixteenth; but was afterwards retained by themselves as proper enough to express their desires of a more pure form of worship and discipline in the Church<sup>z</sup>.

That the schism in the Church of England which began with the reign of Elizabeth had its rise in a difference of opinion concerning rites and ceremonies, is a fact not reluctantly acknowledged, but obtrusively displayed by the Puritanical historians. But a schism occasioned by a

<sup>y</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. Preface, p. vi.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. p. vii.

diversity in public worship, and opposition with respect to ceremonies, proved infinitely more pernicious than if it had arisen in any contrariety of doctrine. Its effects were open to common observation, and were immediately visible in the irregularities attendant on the celebration of divine offices, irregularities tending to bring all public worship into contempt.

This great practical evil was forced on the notice of Cecil, and was by him submitted to the Queen; <sup>1564</sup> and he thus faithfully represented the irreverend and incongruous manner in which the services of the Church were performed: "Some perform divine service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some in a seat made in the church; some in the pulpit, with their faces to the people; some keep precisely to the order of the book, others intermix psalms in metre; some officiate with a surplice, and others without it. In some places the table stands in the body of the church, in others it stands in the chancel; in some places it stands altarwise, distant from the wall a yard; in others it stands in the middle of the chancel, north and south; in some places the table is joined, in others it stands upon tressels; in some the table has a carpet, in others none. Some administer the communion with surplice and cap, some with surplice alone, some with neither; some with chalice, others with a communion cup; some with unleavened bread, others with leavened; some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting; some baptize in a font, others in a basin; some sign with the sign of a cross, others make no sign; some administer in a surplice, others without; some with a square cap, some with a round cap, some with a button cap, some with a hat, some in scholar's clothes, some in others <sup>a</sup>."

This representation bears the marks of Cecil's official

<sup>a</sup> Strype's Life of Parker, book ii. c. xix. p. 300. and Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 154.

accuracy, and as it was not exaggerated, was received by the Queen with attention. Her displeasure was excited by this total want of decency and uniformity, and she directed the two Archbishops to confer with the ecclesiastical commissions, and to institute an inquiry into the prevailing diversities in rites, ceremonies, or doctrine. The Bishops were commanded to restore an exact uniformity in all external ordinances, as they were established by law or custom, and they were to admit no one to any ecclesiastical preferment, unless he was disposed to observe good discipline, and formally promised to comply with it.

Many of the Bishops had at first entertained scruples concerning the propriety of those ceremonies which the Queen had determined to retain, and particularly of the habits. But however strong might be their scruples, they differed from their weaker brethren, in preferring to comply, rather than to desert their ministry. They obeyed the law, thinking that obedience was not sinful; and they had reason to apprehend, that if they left their stations on account of their nonconformity to indifferent things, their enemies would supply their places<sup>b</sup>. Still they had a tenderness for those who conscientiously refused to comply, and Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, particularly exerted himself to obtain some relaxation in their favour. In a letter to the Earl of Leicester, he pleaded, "that by straining the point of conformity, a great many worthy men would be lost for trifles, and many parishes disfurnished of a preacher." But his own compliance abated the force of his reasoning, and he shewed that "his compassion was stronger than his logic<sup>c</sup>." Whittingham, Dean of Durham, well known in the troubles of Frankfort, wrote to the same nobleman, and he argued with more consistency and strength, because his practice was conformable with his sentiments.

<sup>b</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 166.

<sup>c</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 386 and 388.

The interference of the Earl of Leicester softened the Queen's inflexibility, and though the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, at her command, promulgated Articles of Conformity<sup>d</sup>, yet she refused to confirm them. The Dissenters, having some of the courtiers in their interest, refused submission, and Parker could not refrain from openly complaining of the tergiversation of the Court<sup>e</sup>. It would have been better if nothing had been attempted, because the Dissenters were provoked, instead of being reformed. Notwithstanding this want of support from royal authority, himself and the rest of the Commissioners were resolved to perform their duty, and to proceed against the non-compliers.

Among those divines who were the most inflexible in refusing to comply with the discipline of the Church were Samson and Humfreys. Each of them held a distinguished station in the University of Oxford, Samson being the Dean of Christ Church, and Humfreys the President of Magdalen College, and Regius Professor of Divinity. They were men of considerable learning, but their prejudices were stronger than their reason: they had both been exiles, and were, consequently, known to the foreign Reformers. Parker, therefore, thought that the judgment of Bucer and Martyr might have some weight, and urged their opinion in the case of Hooper; but to such authorities Samson and Humfreys were impenetrable. After a long attendance, and receiving many severe admonitions from the Council, they framed a supplicatory letter in Latin, addressed to the Archbishop and the other Commissioners. They protested before God, what an affliction it was to them, that there should be such dissensions about a cap and surplice among persons of the same faith. But "conscience," they observed, "is a tender thing, and all

<sup>d</sup> Or Advertisements. They are contained in Bishop Sparrow's Collections, p. 121.

<sup>e</sup> Strype's Life of Parker, book ii. c. xx. p. 317.

men cannot look upon the same things as indifferent: if, therefore, these habits seem so to you, you are not to be condemned by us; on the other hand, if they do not appear so to us, we ought not to be vexed by you<sup>f</sup>."

1565 While their case was under discussion, they attempted to fortify their opinion by the suffrage of some of the most eminent among the foreign divines. Horn, Bishop of Winchester, had been the organ of the Non-conformists, and had laid before Gualter and Bullinger the difficulties and the dissensions which prevailed in the Church. The answers of these foreigners shew an admirable temper, when it is considered, that the ceremonies of which the English Dissenters complained were not practised in the foreign Churches. Bullinger, in particular, used irresistible arguments to convince the Nonconformists, as well as the most urgent persuasions to gain their compliance<sup>g</sup>.

When Samson and Humfreys understood in what manner Bullinger and Gualter had answered the complaints of Horn, they transmitted a prolix justification of their non-conformity. Their letters were noticed with due respect by Bullinger, yet he was not inclined, by any reasons which they had offered, to retract his former judgment. All their objections had been fully stated by Horn, and they had been answered; if the answers were not satisfactory, he had only to express his sorrow. To controversies of that kind he had a great dislike, and never willingly interfered in them. But he could not forbear, on their requisition, to repeat his opinion, that laws might be prescribed concerning the habits of the Clergy, and that these laws might be in conformity with the advice of the Apostle. Saint Paul said, that a Bishop ought to be decent, [‘κόσμιον,’ 1 Tim. iii. 2.] a word applicable to the habit as well as the demeanour. Regulations of this sort were not a revival of the Levitical law, for every ceremony practised by the Jews

<sup>f</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 169.

<sup>g</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. vi. no. 76.

ought not to be called Levitical. The Apostles commanded the Christian converts to abstain from things strangled and from blood. The maintenance of the clergy by tithes was derived from the Jews; from them also was derived the use of Psalms in divine worship; so that a conformity to the institutions of Moses is not of itself a valid reason for the rejection of any practice. Neither ought the use of the sacerdotal habits to be called a conformity to Popery, nor to be rejected merely because they are used by Papists; for, by the same reason, it would be right to desert churches, to receive no stipend for the performance of ministerial offices, to discontinue baptism, to disuse the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds, and at length to reject the Lord's Prayer. The habits were not enjoined from superstitious motives, but on the grounds of decency and unity. He ended his letter with an earnest persuasion to all the dissentients to consider seriously, whether it would not be more conducive to edification to use the prescribed habits on these grounds only, than to see the fold of Christ desolated, if not by wolves, yet by careless and unfaithful shepherds<sup>h</sup>?

A copy of this letter was sent to Horn, and both Grindal and himself, thinking that it would operate irresistibly in settling the minds of many weak though conscientious men, issued an order for its publication. But Samson and Humfreys were dissatisfied at those clear arguments and temperate remonstrances by which their own conduct was condemned. They complained to Bullinger of the publication of his letter, and carried their objections against the ecclesiastical polity of England to a greater length. They expressed their dislike of the music in cathedrals, and their disapprobation of organs; they dissented from the practice of sponsors in baptism, and to the signing the cross in that Sacrament; and they inveighed with great warmth against the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts.

<sup>h</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. vi. no. 77.

Bullinger and Gualter rejoined, and preserving their former moderation, reminded their angry correspondents, ‘that they should not have given their opinion if it had not been solicited. They were not sanguine enough to expect that their answer would be completely satisfactory, but had no expectation that it would have given offence. They were resolved to engage no farther in the controversy: as for the habits, they still thought it better to use them than to desert the Ministry: farther than this they would not go, and protested against giving any countenance or approbation to Popish defilements and superstitions. The other matters of complaint were of a graver nature than about surplices or copes, and they trusted that their defence of the habits might not be construed into a defence of any real abuse or error. But it should be ever remembered, that the unity of the Church was broken by nothing more frequently than by an overbearing and impetuous temper. It was not only necessary that the end be good, but that it be prosecuted by prudent means<sup>i</sup>.’

Perceiving that the division was likely to be extended to other matters than the vestments, Bullinger and Gualter thought that they might render their friends an effectual service by soliciting the interposition of the Earl of Bedford. They stated to this nobleman, that when they first heard of the contention, they feared that it would increase, and bring greater evil on the Church. As to the habits, they had always expressed their opinion, that it was not right in the Clergy to desert their stations for a matter so unimportant. They were sorry that a private letter of theirs should have been printed; and they were still more grieved, that their defence of the vestments should have been construed into a defence of other abuses, which they could not by any means approve. They implored him to intercede with the Queen and Nobility for an indulgence towards those weaker members of the Church, whose

<sup>i</sup> Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. vi. no. 80.

errors proceeded from an excess of zeal, and an ardent love of spiritual religion<sup>k</sup>.

With Horn and Grindal they also remonstrated on the impropriety of publishing a letter intended only for private use. They had no wish to aggravate the contentions in England, but would exert themselves to mitigate such unhappy disputes; and they repeated their protestation against affording any countenance to superstition or error<sup>l</sup>. The two English Prelates defended themselves from any dishonourable motive in printing the letter. When it was published, the names of the persons to whom it was addressed were suppressed, and its publication had been attended by the most salutary effects. It had satisfied and settled the minds of many who were on the point of leaving the communion of the Church; and even the most violent were so far convinced by its arguments, that they were either silent, or less clamorous in their opposition than formerly. A few divines had been ejected from their stations, but only a few; and, whatever might be their sincerity, these were not distinguished for learning: Samson was the only ejected minister who merited the appellation of learned. Humfrey still continued in his place, with the most eminent of the Nonconformists.

Grindal and Horn were not satisfied with vindicating their personal conduct in publishing Bullinger's letter; they proceeded to vindicate the polity of the English Church. They maintained, that the vestments might be lawfully used, on the ground of decency and order; their opponents denied that the vestments were a matter of indifference, because of their former popish and idolatrous use. But if the vestments were rejected on this account, the Priesthood might for the same reason be rejected; for it was derived from Popery, or from a mixture of Popery and Lutheranism<sup>m</sup>. As to the other complaints of the

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. no. 81.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. no. 82.

<sup>m</sup> "Papisticum profectò vel saltem Lutherano-papisticum haberemus

Nonconformists, some were more reasonable. Organs and figured music were not approved by Grindal and Horn; the Baptism of infants by women they strongly opposed. The practice of sponsors they submitted to, as a temporary evil, to be rectified in better times: that of kneeling at the Communion was permitted, after a caution that no adoration of the elements was intended.

In the conclusion of their letter, they noticed one calumnious insinuation, which had been industriously propagated, and with too great success, that the whole ecclesiastical government was in the hands of the Bishops. This assertion was evidently false; for although a priority was given to the Episcopal order, yet in the national Synod, convened by a royal edict, the inferior Clergy triply exceeded the Bishops, and a free licence was granted to every member to deliver his opinion. A farther reformation was sincerely wished by Grindal and Horn, and they had laboured to promote it: they would not relax in their future efforts, but would persevere, even if perseverance were unattended with success. Their aim was to correct and amend all abuses and errors by the standard of the word of God.

As Samson and Humfreys were the most eminent among the non-compliers, the strongest exertions were used to secure their conformity, both by argument and intimidation. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners were divided as to the measures necessary to be adopted; some were in favour of a compromise, and others of connivance; but Parker, who was at the head of the High Commission Court, would abate nothing of the Queen's Injunctions. Both Humfreys and Samson were placed under confinement, but the largest measure of severity was apportioned to Samson. By a special order from the Queen, he was deprived of his Deanery; but, as a proof of Parker's lenity, *ministerium, aut omnino nullum.*" Burnet's Hist. Ref. Coll. Rec. vol. iii. b. vi. no. 83.

it should be recorded, that, by his interposition, some favour was shewn towards the ejected Dean by the Chapter of Christ Church; and the Primate also earnestly solicited Cecil, that "as the Queen's pleasure had been executed for example and terror to others, it might be mollified to the commendation of her clemency." The royal displeasure was in time mitigated, and Samson was appointed a Prebendary in Saint Paul's Cathedral, and was permitted to hold the Lectureship in Divinity of Whittingdon College in London. Humfreys resigned his place in the University of Oxford; but his interest at Court was so powerful, that he obtained a toleration for his nonconformity, until, by the solicitations of Cecil, he was persuaded to wear the habits. Preferment more valuable than that which he had relinquished awaited his declining years, and a successive appointment to the Deaneries of Gloucester and Winchester rewarded the chaplain and biographer of Jewel<sup>n</sup>.

While the case of the Oxford Divines was under consideration, Parker was endeavouring to bring the 1564 London Clergy to conformity, but a similar spirit of resistance was displayed. The Archbishop had vainly endeavoured to obtain from the Queen a relaxation of the royal Injunctions relating to clerical apparel, but Elizabeth was not to be moved from her resolution. A Proclamation was issued by her command, peremptorily requiring an uniformity of habit, on pain of prohibition from preaching, and of deprivation. In consequence of this Proclamation, the Archbishop, with the consent of the other members of the High Commission Court, summoned the whole body of the London Clergy to appear before him at Lambeth, to receive their answer to the question, Whether they would promote conformity to the apparel as it was prescribed by law, and would testify their promise by subscription? Those who demurred were immediately to be

<sup>n</sup> Maddox's Vindication, &c. against Neal, p. 324. Strype's Life of Parker, book iii. c. 1. p. 368.

suspended from preaching, and after three months, if they persisted in their contumacy, to be deprived. To prepare the way for this general citation, Fox the martyrologist was summoned separately, from an expectation that he might be induced to conform, and that his conformity would have a powerful effect on others. But when his subscription was demanded, he took from his pocket his Greek Testament, and said, "To this I will subscribe." When the Canons were exhibited to him, he refused his signature or assent. "I have nothing," he said, "but a Prebend in the Church of Salisbury, and much good may it do you, if you take it from me<sup>n</sup>." It is equally honourable to Fox, to the Queen, and to the English Prelacy, that the venerable Nonconformist was suffered to remain in the unmolested enjoyment of his humble preferment, and of his inoffensive prejudices. If he endured poverty, he escaped persecution<sup>o</sup>.

On the day appointed for the appearance of the London Clergy, the Archbishop desired the aid of the Secretary of State, with some of the Nobility and Privy Council; but they refused to be present. Sixty-one out of a hundred were induced to subscribe, and thirty-seven gave an absolute refusal. The recusants were immediately suspended, with an admonition that deprivation would ensue, if they did not conform within three months. The nonconforming Ministers delivered a paper, containing the reasons of their refusal.

That the royal Injunctions might extend beyond Incumbents and Curates, the Archbishop revoked all licences for preaching, and obliged all preachers to renew them. Those Ministers who refused to conform travelled about

<sup>n</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 173.

<sup>o</sup> For the worth of Foxe's testimony as an historian, and the incompetency of his last editors, see Letters by the Rev. S. R. Maitland in Brit. Mag. vols. xi. xii.

the kingdom, preaching in those churches where they could find admission, as if they had been Apostles<sup>p</sup>.

There was still one door of entrance into the pulpit left open to the Puritanical Ministers, and which Parker unsuccessfully attempted to close. There was a privilege granted to the University of Cambridge by Pope Alexander the Sixth [1492], empowering that academical body to license twelve Ministers yearly, who might preach in any part of England, without leave of the Bishop of the Diocese or the Archbishop of the Province, and the licence was to continue as long as life. The Puritans, when it suited their purpose, were not reluctant to shelter themselves under the authority of a Papal Bull; and it was without effect that Parker applied to Cecil, the Chancellor of the University, praying him to set aside so disorderly a practice. The Vice-Chancellor was cited to defend the privileges of the University, which he did so entirely to the satisfaction of Cecil, that the obnoxious privilege was confirmed<sup>q</sup>.

Cambridge had long been the favoured seat of puritanical disaffection, and the question of the vestments had been debated there with considerable warmth. Longworth, the Master of Saint John's College, being absent on some particular occasion, the students of that house, to the number of three hundred, came to chapel on a festival day without their hoods and surplices, and continued in the practice for some time; the Master on his return making no complaint, nor endeavouring to bring them back to conformity. In Trinity College, all the students except three declared against the use of the surplice, and many in other Colleges were ready to follow the example. Intelligence of this violation of discipline having been sent to Cecil, the Chancellor, he admonished the Vice-Chan-

<sup>p</sup> Bishop Jewel, quoted by Neal; Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 178.

<sup>q</sup> Strype's Life of Parker, book iii. c. iii. p. 382. Bp. Maddox's Vind. against Neal, App. p. 329.

cellor and the other Heads of Colleges, as they tendered the honour of God, the preservation of Christian unity, the reputation of the University, the favour of the Queen, and his own good will, that they should return to their former usages, and continue to wear the prescribed habits. The Heads of some Colleges interceded for an indulgence to those who had conscientious scruples, but the intercession was rejected with manifestations of displeasure. Longworth, in whose College the breach of discipline began, was cited before the Court of High Commission, and was obliged to sign and read a public recantation<sup>r</sup>.

Every application to the Queen and the Commissioners for a relaxation of the Injunctions having proved ineffectual, the deprived Ministers published a vindication of their conduct. The Bishops were not slow in answering the arguments of their antagonists; but the High Commissioners went farther, and resorted to an expedient which need not have been adopted, because it is the resource of those who are conscious of the weakness of their cause. They imposed more severe restraints on the liberty of the press, and decreed that no book should be published or printed against the Queen's Injunctions, that all offenders should be punished by imprisonment and forfeiture of their books, and that the Wardens of the Company of Stationers should be empowered to search all suspected places, and to seize all obnoxious books. This decree was signed by eight of the Privy Council, in addition to seven of the High Commissioners.

This arbitrary measure accelerated the open separation of the Nonconformists from the Church. After waiting two months in the hope that some tenderness might be shewn towards their scruples, several of the deprived Ministers held a consultation with their friends and followers. After prayer to God, and serious deliberation among themselves, they came to a resolution, that as they

<sup>r</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. iv. p. 181.

could not have the Word of God preached, nor the Sacraments administered, without the idolatrous vestments; and since there had been a separate congregation, in London as well as at Geneva, which used a form of worship and discussion approved by Calvin himself; it was therefore their duty to separate from the public churches, and to assemble as they could find opportunity, in private houses or elsewhere, to worship God in a manner which might not offend the light of their consciences<sup>s</sup>.

It was a matter of some discussion, whether they should continue to use as much of the Liturgy as they were able conscientiously to approve, or whether, since they were in a state of separation, they should at once establish a form of worship more consonant to the holy Scriptures and the practice of foreign Churches. The last alteration was adopted, and, accordingly, the English Liturgy was entirely rejected, and the Genevan Service Book substituted in its place.

It has been more than once asserted, by the advocates of puritanical separation, that the Puritans would have continued within the Church, if they could have obtained indulgence for their scruples concerning the habits and some other ceremonies. But when the separation had been effected, it was discovered that they entertained other and graver objections against the ecclesiastical Establishment<sup>t</sup>. This amounts to an acknowledgment that they would have sacrificed their conscientious and substantial reasons of dissent, if they could have been indulged in matters which they repeatedly affirmed were indifferent, or at least unessential.

A concealed dislike of Episcopacy was the spring which prompted all their measures, and no sooner had the separation taken place, than this secret disaffection was vented in acts of open hostility. Then their objections were set in full array, and displayed in formidable regu-

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. p. 187.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. vol. i. c. v. p. 191.

larity. 1. They complained that Bishops affected to be a superior order to Presbyters, claiming the sole right of Ordination, and of exercising discipline; and they disapproved of the temporal dignities annexed to the Episcopal office. 2. They excepted to the titles and offices of Archdeacons, Deans, and Chapters, as having no foundation in Scripture or primitive antiquity. 3. They complained of the exorbitant power and jurisdiction of the spiritual courts, as being derived from the Canon Law, and not from the Word of God, though they allowed the necessity, and lamented the want of a godly and primitive discipline. 4. Though they admitted the lawfulness of forms of prayer, yet they contended for an occasional liberty of using unpremeditated prayer, or a prayer composed by the Minister; and in the English Liturgy, they objected to the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer, and the interruptions in the other prayers by responses. 5. They disliked the practice of reading the Apocryphal Scriptures in the church; and though they did not altogether disapprove of Homilies, yet they thought that no man should be a Minister of the Gospel who was incapable of expounding the Scriptures. 6. They condemned the observance of Festivals or Holidays, of keeping Lent, as being unwarranted by Scripture. 7. They disallowed the cathedral mode of worship, the chanting the prayers and antiphone, which the Reformers of Edward disapproved; and they condemned all musical instruments, particularly organs, which were not in use during the first twelve centuries. 8. They scrupled to conform to certain rites and ceremonies; such as the cross in Baptism, the practice of sponsors, the mode of administering Confirmation, kneeling at the Communion, bowing at the name of Jesus, the ring in marriage, and, lastly, the use of the surplice. These things, they alleged, gave offence to weak minds; and therefore these abuses, every one, in his station and according to his ability, should labour to reform; Ministers

by the word, Magistrates by authority, and the people by prayer<sup>u</sup>.

The leaders of the original separation were not men of high attainments, because the most eminent of the Puritanical Ministers still remained within the pale of the Church. Soon, however, they increased in numbers and consideration; and while they weakened the Church by open schism, or distracted it by internal broils, the Church of Rome turned these divisions to her own advantage.

A sudden illness of Elizabeth, and the prospective <sup>1568</sup> succession of the Queen of Scotland, infused sanguine hope into the hitherto quiescent Papists; and the dangers which impended over the Protestant cause were not lessened by the compulsory renunciation by Mary of the Scottish Crown, by the abolition of the Papal jurisdiction in Scotland, and by the imprisonment of the Scottish Queen in the English dominions. The Romish party was inspirited by certain pretended prophecies that the reign of Elizabeth should not exceed twelve years; and its numbers being formidable, as well as widely spread, it was not easily suppressed by the existing laws. In Lancashire the Common Prayer Book was laid aside, the churches shut up, and the Mass was celebrated openly<sup>x</sup>. As Cambridge was the seat of Puritanism, so Oxford was overrun with Papists. Two of the Colleges, New College and Corpus Christi, were so far addicted to the Church of Rome, that their Visitor, the Bishop of Winchester, was refused admittance, and his entrance was at last effected by force. Great numbers of Papists were harboured in the Inns of Court, expecting with impatience the death of Elizabeth, and the succession of the presumptive heir, Mary, Queen of Scotland.

The Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland had long been suspected of disaffection, and were commanded

<sup>u</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. v. p. 192—196.

<sup>x</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. i. part ii. c. li. p. 257.

to appear at Court to exculpate themselves from the charge; but, instead of obeying the summons, they collected their partisans to the number of four thousand, and avowed their intention of restoring the Romish religion, and of liberating the Queen of the Scots. Having organized an army, they entered the city of Durham, and restored the Mass in all the churches. But as the English army under the command of the Duke of Suffolk advanced, the insurgents dispersed without even hazarding a battle. The Earl of Northumberland was apprehended within the Scottish dominions, delivered to the English by the Earl of Murray, and executed at York. The Earl of Westmoreland escaped into Flanders, and died in poverty.<sup>y</sup>

The Romanists throughout England were far from joining in this desperate attempt, and even offering to their Protestant Sovereign aid against the rebels of their own religion; but the Jesuits, being defeated in their military warfare, resolved on a more secret but sure method of assailing the Church and kingdom. They projected the foundation of foreign seminaries for the education of English missionaries, who might afterwards return to their native country and propagate their faith. A College was in this year founded at Douay, under the patronage of Philip the Second, King of Spain, of which William Allen, afterwards promoted to the rank of a Cardinal, was appointed the Superior.

And now the Court of Rome, exasperated by the assistance which Elizabeth had lately rendered to the Hugonots, resolved to proceed to extremities, and to declare her excommunicated. By virtue of a Bull of Pope Pius the Fifth, Elizabeth, pretended Queen of England, and all heretics adhering to her, were solemnly anathematized, her subjects were absolved from their allegiance,

<sup>y</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. v. p. 206. But Camden says that Westmoreland commanded a regiment belonging to the King of Spain.

and all other engagements whatsoever. She is styled a usurper, and a vassal of iniquity, and is declared deprived of all her dominions<sup>z</sup>. All those who presumed to obey her commands were involved in the same sentence of excommunication with herself, and all foreign Potentates were encouraged to take up arms against her.

The Bull was dispersed in England by the assiduity of Allen, the Superior of the English College at Douay, but it was soon found that the thunders of the Vatican had lost much of their terror, and all their destructiveness. Those Princes of Europe who were in communion with the Church of Rome, and in alliance with the Ecclesiastical State, were not forward to avail themselves of the Papal sanction for dethroning Elizabeth; and her Popish subjects, after the suppression of the rebellions excited by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, were quiet, if not obedient. The Queen, notwithstanding the provocations which she had received from the Romish See, gave the Romanists a public assurance of her protection while their deportment was peaceable. It was "not her intention to press into the retirements of conscience," but all who lived in obedience to the laws should be equally entitled to their protection<sup>a</sup>.

While the Government was menaced by the Court of Rome, the Puritans improved the opportunity to widen their schism with the Church, by raising new scruples against conformity, and bringing to perfection their new scheme of discipline. The polemical attack was conducted, not by a separatist, but by one who held an important station in the Establishment. Thomas Cartwright, Fellow of Trinity College, and Margaret Professor in the University of Cambridge, is a name of too great celebrity in

<sup>z</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 461. He has translated the Bull as it stands in Sanders's Book de Schismate Anglicano.

<sup>a</sup> Queen's declaration, published in the Star-chamber. Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 471. Camden's Elizabeth, p. 126.

the annals of Puritanism, to be dismissed without some observations on his early life. When Queen Elizabeth honoured the University of Cambridge with a visit, Cartwright and Preston were selected to sustain the part of opponents in a philosophical disputation; but the superiority of Preston called from the Queen decided marks of approbation, and of preference to his competitor. Cartwright could not dissemble his mortification, and from that time is dated his disaffection to the ecclesiastical constitution. That disgust at the distinctions bestowed on his opponent was the true cause of his hostility to the Church is not improbable<sup>b</sup>, but that his dislike of Episcopacy incited him to travel to Geneva is certain. Having obtained an intimate knowledge of the Genevan discipline, having been personally acquainted with Beza<sup>c</sup>, and heard the invectives of the successor of Calvin against the English

1570 hierarchy, he returned to his native country, and to the place of his education. The strength of the Puritanical party was successfully exerted in electing him to the Margaret Professorship, and he was thus enabled to promulge his opinions with authority. He animadverted in his Lectures with great severity on the English hierarchy, and particularly against the following abuses: 1. The names and functions of Archbishops and Bishops ought to be suppressed, as having no foundation in Scripture. 2. The offices of the only lawful Ministers of the Church, Bishops and Deacons, ought to be reduced to the Apostolical institution; the Bishops to preach the Word of God and to pray, and the Deacons to take care of the poor. 3. The government of the Church ought not to be

<sup>b</sup> Sir George Paul's Life of Archbishop Whitgift, in Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. vol. iv. Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 471. Strype's Annals, vol. i. part ii. c. lvii. p. 373.

<sup>c</sup> Beza said of Cartwright, "that, in his opinion, there was not a more learned Divine under the sun." Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. v. p. 212.

intrusted to the Chancellors of Bishops, or the Officials of Archdeacons, but every Church ought to be governed by its own Minister and Presbyters. 4. Ministers ought not to wander at large, but every one should take care of a certain flock. 5. No one should solicit for the Ministerial function, or stand as a candidate for the Ministry. 6. Bishops ought not to be created by civil authority, but to be fairly chosen by the Church<sup>d</sup>.

These propositions, boldly and authoritatively delivered by a man high in academical office, could not pass unnoticed. They were transmitted to Cecil, as Chancellor of the University, who advised his Vice-Chancellor to silence their author, or to insist on a public recantation. To mitigate the resentment of Cecil, a testimonial in favour of Cartwright was signed by some distinguished names in the University, declaring that the subscribers had attended his Lectures, and that he had never touched on the controversy of the habits; and though he had advanced some propositions with regard to the Ministry, according to which he wished to see the Ecclesiastical Establishment modelled, yet he delivered himself with all imaginable caution and modesty. Cartwright also addressed Cecil in a Latin letter, in which he repeated the declaration of the testimonial, that he had avoided to speak concerning the habits, but acknowledged that he had represented the English hierarchy as not framed after the Apostolical model. Yet, even on this point, he had not delivered his sentiments with arrogance, as the whole University could testify. He prayed the Chancellor to hear and judge the cause himself, but Cecil wisely referred the cause to the decision of the University. Cartwright was denied his grace for his Doctor's Degree, was then prohibited from reading as a Public Lecturer, was also deprived of his Fellowship, and, finally, was expelled the University. Deprived of all ecclesiastical and academical offices, he

<sup>d</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. v. p. 212.

again left England; and having been chosen pastor of a congregation, first at Antwerp, and then at Middleburgh, the Church of England and the University of Cambridge were left in comparative tranquillity.

To oppose this formidable antagonist of Episcopacy, not by the strong arm of power, but by the fair weapons of controversy, Whitgift applied his early vigour, and Jewel devoted his last labours. Whitgift and Cartwright could not agree on the terms of a controversy, more than on the questions which divided them. The one declined a public disputation, unless he had a licence from the Queen<sup>e</sup>, and the other entirely refused a written discussion. But Whitgift, to check the doctrines of Cartwright, answered and refuted them in the same pulpit where they were delivered, and with such ability, that many were prevented from adopting the opinions of the champion of nonconformity. On his first return to England, and even after his elevation to the episcopal order, Jewel had expressed himself in strong terms against the use of the habits; but subsequent reflection, and an attentive observation of the evils of schism, had induced a change in his opinion. He saw that some were so eager in disputing on this matter, as if it comprised the whole substance and business of religion; he saw that many useful and pious Ministers had left their stations and churches, rather than concede a point which, after all, was indifferent<sup>f</sup>; he saw, likewise, that, although the habits were made a pretext for separation, yet they were not the real cause. It cannot therefore be wondered, that he was inclined to exact from

<sup>e</sup> "Because his assertions be repugnant to the state of the Commonwealth, which may not be called into question by public disputation without licence of the Prince, or her Highness's Counsel." Act of the University of Cambridge, recorded in the registry book, dated March 18, 1570. Sir G. Paul's Life of Whitgift, Words. Eccl. Biog. vol. iv. p. 329.

<sup>f</sup> Jewel's Letter to Bullinger, dated February 26, 1567.

others that obedience to the laws which he himself, after a serious and scrupulous deliberation, was prepared to yield. So tenacious was he of discipline, that he refused to his own Chaplain, Humfreys, institution to a small benefice, given to him by the Bishop of Winchester, solely on account of nonconformity to the prescribed habits. He wrote to the Archbishop, that, in respect of the vain contention raised by Humfreys concerning apparel, he thought it best to wait till he had received the direction of the Metropolitan, and that lenity and sufferance occasioned great disorders<sup>g</sup>.

The dangers which impended over the Church  
and kingdom, from the machinations of the Papists      1571.  
and the Puritans, determined Elizabeth to sum- April 2.  
mon a Parliament. The Session was opened by the following impressive speech from the Queen: "My right loving Lords, and you, our right faithful and obedient subjects, we, in the Name of God, for His service, and for the safety of this State, are now here assembled to His glory, I hope, and pray that it may be to your comfort, and the common quiet of our, yours, and all ours, for ever<sup>h</sup>."

There was a spirit in the House of Commons to attempt some legal relief for the Puritans, and a Bill was introduced for a farther reformation in the Church, enforced by a speech from Mr. Strickland, in disparagement of the Liturgy. A second speech from the same Member was answered by the Treasurer of the household, who said, "that all matters of ceremonies were to be referred to the Queen, and that it was unbecoming in the Commons to meddle with the royal prerogative." But this reprehension not being sufficient, a message was sent to the Committees of the Lower House, purporting that "she approved their good endeavours, but would not suffer these matters to be regulated by Parliament<sup>i</sup>."

<sup>g</sup> See Le Bas' Life of Jewel, p. 74.

<sup>h</sup> D'Ewes's Journal, p. 137.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. p. 176.

The temper of the Commons probably impeded the Parliamentary confirmation of the body of ecclesiastical laws drawn up in the reign of Edward the Sixth<sup>k</sup>. But the Queen succeeded in procuring the enactment of several laws by which her prerogatives were strengthened. A Statute was passed<sup>l</sup>, making it high treason to call the Queen a heretic, a schismatic, an infidel, or an usurper; to publish or put in use any Bull of absolution, or reconciliation to the Bishop of Rome. To conceal, or not to discover, offences of this kind, was made misprision of treason.

The Convocation which sat with this Parliament was opened by a sermon from Whitgift, who dilated on the dangers which threatened the Church both from the Papists and Puritans. To secure the Clergy from the errors of either, it was ordered, that such of the Lower House of Convocation as had not already subscribed the thirty-nine Articles should subscribe without delay; and an unreasonable procrastination, as well as an absolute refusal, should be punished by expulsion from the House. It was farther ordered, that the Book of Articles thus subscribed and approved, should be printed by the appointment and under the superintendence of the Bishop of Salisbury [Jewel].

To secure the government from the Papists on the one hand, and from the Puritans on the other, a protestation was drawn up, to be taken by each of these parties. The Papists were to confess that Elizabeth was the lawful Queen of England, notwithstanding any act or sentence of the Bishop of Rome; and the Puritans were to make a similar profession, in opposition to any act or sentence of any church, synod, consistory, or ecclesiastical assembly.

The proceedings of the Convocation were confirmed by the authority of Parliament, and were the foundation of an

<sup>k</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 488.

<sup>l</sup> Stat. 13 Elizabeth, c. 1.

Act “for reformation of disorders in the Ministers of the Church<sup>m</sup>.” It obliges the Clergy to declare their assent to all the Articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments; and enacts, that if any ecclesiastical person shall advisedly maintain any doctrine contrary to these Articles, and shall refuse to retract his error, or, having retracted, shall relapse, he shall be deprived by the Bishop of the diocese. All admissions to benefices, and all tolerations, dispensations, qualifications, and licences, contrary to the form and provision of the Act, are declared void in law.

It cannot be denied that the penal Statutes of this Session were directed impartially against the Papists and the Puritans; but that their pressure was felt more severely by the latter, must be attributed to the menacing attitude which the Puritans at this time assumed. The activity and vigilance of Jewel were always seasonably applied, and in the last year of his life were directed against Puritanical errors. His exertions were not confined to the Convocation and the Parliament; they were shewn in his peculiar sphere, the pulpit. At the beginning of his Episcopate, he had encountered the Papists; at its close, he entered the lists with the Puritans, on that theatre of polemical theology, Saint Paul’s Cross. His warfare with the Papists had never been remitted, for in the preceding year he had engaged in the defence of the regal power against the fulminations of Pius the Fifth<sup>n</sup>. His controversy with the Puritans, nothing but the danger which threatened the kingdom could have urged him to begin; but an awful sense of duty prevailed over every consideration of ease, popularity, or private friendship, because all were sacrificed. Nothing which came from the pen or fell from the lips of

<sup>m</sup> Stat. 13 Elizabeth, c. 12.

<sup>n</sup> View of a seditious Bull, sent into England from Pius V. Bishop of Rome, 1569.

Jewel was without effect, and the deep sensation occasioned by his last sermon was thus alluded to by himself on his death-bed: “ My last sermon at St. Paul’s, and the conference which I had with some of my brethren, concerning the present state of the Church, was not undertaken to please any mortal man, or to exasperate or trouble those who thought otherwise than I did; but lest either party should prejudice the other, and that the love of God through the Holy Ghost, which is given to us, might be shed abroad in our hearts.” He subjoined his opinion, that these contentions were kindled and fomented by the Popish party, and that many of the Puritans were Papists in disguise. The discernment of Jewel experience fully proved, and it was ascertained that the most popular preachers of the Puritanical doctrines were Popish Priests<sup>p</sup>. What Jewel thought of those who contemned discipline<sup>q</sup> and violated unity, under a pretence of purity and perfection, appears from the following passage in his sermon: “ By what name shall I call you? I would I might call you brethren; but, alas! this heart of yours is not brotherly. I would I might call you Christians; but, alas! you are no Christians. I know not by what name I shall call you; for if you were brethren, you would love as brethren; if you were Christians, you would agree as Christians.”

The Puritans of his own time, and the historians of Puritanism, have endeavoured to cast a shade over the lustre

<sup>o</sup> Life of Jewel, prefixed to his Apology, Wordsw. Ecc. Biog. vol. iv. p. 64.

<sup>p</sup> As Coleman, Button, and Hallingham, and Thomas Heath, a Jesuit, brother to the Archbishop of York. For a proof of this fact, the reader is referred to Nalson’s Collections, Preface to vol. i. p. lxiv. Strype’s Annals, vol. i. part ii. c. lii. p. 272. Strype’s Life of Parker, book iii. c. xvi. p. 478. Bp. Maddox’s Vind. against Neal, p. 326. and Collier’s Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 453.

<sup>q</sup> The Bishop said, “ Stultitia nata est in corde pueri, et virga disciplinæ fugabit illam.”—Prov. c. xxii. v. 15. Life of Jewel, in Wordsw. Eccl. Biog. vol. iv. p. 65.

of his character, and have insinuated that there was a wide difference between Jewel as an exile, and as a Prelate. His connexion with the Court has been supposed to have rendered him the slave of arbitrary power, and the tool of regal prerogative. On no man could such imputations be charged with greater injustice than on Jewel. Preferment was not only unsought by him, but was forced on his acceptance; and when thus reluctantly accepted, was not converted to the purposes of avarice or ambition, but was applied to edification and charity. He undertook with alacrity the most laborious duties of the pastoral function, and it was his common saying, that a Bishop should die preaching. His own death was conformable to his maxim, for it was probably hastened by his zealous performance of this duty when oppressed by sickness.

Popish, as well as Puritanical, calumny attempted to injure the memory of Jewel; and it was reported, that at the hour of death he retracted his heresies, and returned to the Roman Catholic faith. The calumny was refuted by the testimony of an eye-witness of his dying moments. Unto the end, he ceased not to continue in that belief which he had always professed, and his last words, borrowed from St. Ambrose, proved the sincerity of his faith and the fervency of his hope: “I have not so lived that I am ashamed of having lived, neither do I fear death, for our God is merciful.....”

The writer who has recorded the manner of his death has also subjoined an apostrophe, of which piety and taste equally forbid the suppression: “Be thou thankful to God for giving His Church so worthy an instrument to His glory, and be careful to follow the good doctrine which he left behinde him<sup>r</sup>.....”

<sup>r</sup> Garbrand's Preface to Jewel's View of a Seditious Bull.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

Different Sects of the Puritans.—Their influence in the Council, and in the House of Commons.—First Admonition to Parliament by Field and Wilcox.—Second Admonition to Parliament by Cartwright.—Whitgift's Controversy with Cartwright.—First Presbyterian Congregation at Wandsworth.—Puritans attempt to join the foreign Congregations.—Prophesings of the Clergy.—Parker's Death.—Grindal's Succession.—Refuses to suppress the Prophesings, and is suspended.—Parliament meets, and enacts Penal Statutes against Papists and Puritans.—Further Dissensions.—Death of Grindal, and Succession of Whitgift.—Revives the Discipline of the Church.—Puritans propose their Scheme of Discipline in Parliament, but it is rejected.—Speech of the Queen at the Prorogation of Parliament.

THE Puritans, having now separated from the Church, formed divisions among themselves, and were spread in different branches. A sect, denominated Precisians by Parker, held that obedience to civil government was a thing indifferent, and some of this sect attempted to gain possession of the Royal Chapel, and to preach the Court Sermons in Lent. Another branch of the Puritans were the Brownists, who derived their name from Robert Brown. He was educated in the University of Cambridge, and being a contemporary of Cartwright, embraced his opinions, and at last went farther than Cartwright in dissent. He possessed nothing of Cartwright's moderation; but, in a strain of bitter satire, inveighed against the hierarchy as antichristian, and not better than the mission of the priests of Baal. He had frequently suffered imprisonment on account of his daring violation of the ecclesiastical laws; but his relationship to the secretary Cecil as frequently skreened him from punishment. At length, believing himself conscientiously obliged to go out of the Church as another Babylon, he left his country,

and joined the congregation of Cartwright at Middleburgh : but this communion not reaching his ideas of spiritual perfection, he refined on Cartwright's scheme, and became the founder of a sect. His notions of Christian purity were developed in a treatise on reformation, which he printed at Middleburgh, and sent into England, and having dispersed as many copies as he thought necessary, he resolved to carry his speculations into practice by his personal exertions, and return to his native land. In the latter part of a long life that ended in 1630, he renounced his singularities, and accepted a benefice in the Church ; but his sect outlived the nonconformity of its founder, and was considered to be the most fanatical of all the modifications of Puritanism\*.

At the Council-board the Puritans had many friends, of whom the Earl of Leicester was chief, and in the House of Commons their cause was strenuously defended by Sir Peter Wentworth. The Lord Keeper opened the succeeding Session of Parliament with a recommendation from the Queen, that the laws relating to ecclesiastical discipline might be duly executed ; but the Commons, instead of framing any laws to enforce conformity, permitted the introduction of two Bills to mitigate the laws already enacted. These Bills passed the Commons without much opposition ; but their progress was arrested in the House of Lords. The Queen was so highly incensed, that she commanded the House of Commons, through the Speaker, never to entertain any Bill concerning religion, unless it had been previously approved by the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, and further required that the two ob-

[\* Fuller says of him, 'In a word, he had in my time a wife with whom for many years he never lived, parted from her in some distaste, and a Church (in Northamptonshire) wherein he never preached, though he received the profits thereof. Such was the man who could find no Church, not even Thomas Cartwright's, to realize his ideas of spiritual perfection.' B. ix. sec. 6. subs. 3—7.]

noxious Bills should be resigned to her. This mandate called forth a spirited remonstrance from Wentworth. "It grieves me," he said, "to see in how many ways the liberty of free speech in Parliament hath been infringed. Two things have lately prejudiced it: the one, a rumour which ran through the House, while the Bill concerning rites and ceremonies was depending, that, if it passed, the Queen would be offended; the other, a message brought to the House, either commanding or inhibiting our proceedings. It is dangerous," he added, "always to follow the inclinations of a Prince, because the Prince may favour a cause prejudicial to the honour of God and the good of the State. The Queen has forbidden us to deal in any matter of religion, unless we first receive it from the Bishops. This was a doleful message: there is then little hope of reformation. I have heard from old Parliamentmen, that the banishment of the Pope, and the reforming true religion, had its beginning from this House, and not from the Bishops. Few laws for religion have had their foundation with them, and I do surely think, before God I speak it, that the Bishops were the cause of this doleful message." Such bold language, under the reign of Elizabeth, was not to be uttered with impunity, even in the House of Commons, and Wentworth was sent to the Tower.

In the mean time, the late Act for subscribing the Articles was carried into execution throughout England, and about one hundred Clergymen (as computed by Strype, Ann. vol. ii. c. xx.) were deprived for refusing to subscribe. The University of Cambridge was still a sanctuary for the Puritans, and even the vigilance of Whitgift could not prevent them from shewing a defiance of discipline. One Charke, a Fellow of Peter-house, in a sermon before the University, maintained, that there ought to be a parity of Ministers in the Church, and that the hierarchical Orders were introduced into the Church by Satan.

Deering, a man of reputation for his preaching, both in the University and also at Court, carried his invectives from prelacy to royalty<sup>r</sup>. Deprivation was inflicted on both these Ministers; Charke by the authority of the University, and Deering by the Court of High Commission.

The Puritans, finding that the Queen and the Bishops were resolved not to concede either to persuasion or menace, turned their attention to the Parliament. They had interested many members of the House of Commons in their favour, and, to strengthen this interest, set forth their grievances in a treatise, entitled, "An Admonition to the Parliament," to which were annexed, Beza's Letter to the Earl of Leicester, and Gualter's Letter to Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich. It contained the platform of a Church, the manner of electing Ministers, their several duties, and their equality in government<sup>s</sup>. But it did not rest here: it inveighed with some severity against the corruptions of the hierarchy, and the late proceedings of the Bishops. The Admonition concluded with a Petition to the House of Commons, that a discipline might be established more consonant to the Word of God, and to the practice of foreign Churches. Its authors were two Puritanical Ministers, named Field and Wilcox<sup>t</sup>, and they had the courage to present the Petition to the House: they might have anticipated the result, and it is scarcely necessary to add, that they were committed to prison.

The imprisonment of these two Ministers occasioned

<sup>r</sup> In one of his sermons before the Queen, he said, that when she was under persecution, her motto was, "Tanquam ovis;" but now it might be, "Tanquam indomita juvenca."—Neal's Hist. of the Pur. vol. i. c. vi. p. 283.

<sup>s</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. v. p. 231.

<sup>t</sup> Collier (Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 506.) ascribes the first as well as the second Admonition to Cartwright: but Neal, who was not likely to deprive Cartwright of any thing which he thought meritorious, ascribes the first Admonition to Field and Wilcox.

a second Admonition, by an author of greater notoriety : this was none other than Cartwright, who had returned to England not long before. The second Admonition was expressed in the same style of petition, remonstrance, and invective, as the first. It prayed relief against the subscription required by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, a Court which had no foundation in law, but was constituted by an act of Sovereignty. "The matters," Cartwright observed, "contained in the first Admonition, however true they may be, have found small favour; the persons who were its reputed authors have been laid up in no worse a prison than that of Newgate, the men that set upon them were no worse than Bishops, the name that goeth of them is no better than rebels, and great words there are that their danger will yet prove greater. Well, whatsoever is said or done against them, that is not the matter, but the equity of the cause that is the matter ; and yet this we will say, that the State sheweth itself not upright if it suffers them to be molested for that which was spoken only by way of admonition to Parliament, which was to consider of it, and to receive or reject it, without farther matter to the authors, except it contained some wilful matter of treason or rebellion, which it was not proved to do<sup>x</sup>."

The prisoners themselves composed an apology in Latin, addressed to Cecil, now advanced to that title by which he is known to posterity, that of Lord Burghley; but this application proving unsuccessful, after they had remained in confinement above a year, they petitioned the Earl of Leicester and the Lords of the Council for their liberation. They also wrote a confession of their faith, with a preface, vindicating their conduct from the accusations of their enemies.

The second Admonition to Parliament, as it was the production of Cartwright, and as it called forth an answer

<sup>x</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. v. p. 232.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 233.

from Whitgift, demands a more enlarged notice. It was comprised in twenty-three chapters, comprehending all the matters of complaint which the Puritans had unceasingly urged against the discipline of the Church. As the Puritans had set forth their strongest arguments by their most able advocate, the Bishops thought it incumbent to publish an answer bearing the stamp of authority. Whitgift was judiciously selected, and his answer was submitted to the perusal of Parker himself, of Cooper, then Bishop of Lincoln, and of Pern, Bishop of Ely. A performance thus finished with the greatest care, and revised by the most eminent Prelates, was appropriately dedicated to the Church of England. Its highest eulogy was bestowed, not by the friends, but by the enemies of that Church, which Whitgift so ably defended. By them it was acknowledged, that the method was unexceptionable, the whole text of the Admonition being inserted in paragraphs, and under each paragraph the answer; so that in this book might be seen all the arguments for and against the hierarchy displayed to the best advantage<sup>z</sup>.

It was impossible that Whitgift and Cartwright should settle the controversy, because they differed on principles: Cartwright maintained that the holy Scriptures were not only a standard of religious doctrine, but of ecclesiastical discipline and civil government, and that the Church of Christ, throughout all ages, ought to be governed by the rules of Scripture; all questions ought to be decided by the Bible alone: Whitgift held the contrary principle; that the Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, but not of discipline; that the latter was changeable, and might be accommodated to the civil government; that the discipline prescribed by the Apostles was suitable to the Church in its infant and persecuted state, but might properly be altered when the Church was enlarged, and enjoyed the protection of the civil magistrate. “ The

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. p. 236.

reader will judge of these principles for himself," is the remark of the historian of Puritanism; "and every man who will judge for himself," without prejudice, will determine on the side of Whitgift. If the holy Scriptures were designed as an unalterable model of discipline, it is impossible to avoid the doctrine of a community of goods, and civil government would be no better than an usurpation of the Kingly government of Christ.

Whitgift's answer provoked a reply from Cartwright, which was succeeded by a rejoinder on the part of Whitgift. In the last reply of Whitgift, he thus clearly stated the question at issue: "The question is not, whether many things mentioned in your platform of discipline were fitly used in the time of the Apostles, or may now well be used in sundry reformed Churches; this is not denied: but whether, when there is a settled order in doctrine and government established by law, it may stand with godly and Christian wisdom to attempt so great an alteration as this platform must needs bring in, with disobedience to the prince and the laws, and unquietness of the Church, and offences of many consciences?"

There is no doubt that Cartwright had some admirers, and more abettors; but his character and abilities were regarded with little estimation by an unexceptionable judge, because a zealous defender of Cartwright's doctrinal tenets. This was no other than Whitaker, who dissuaded Whitgift from attempting a second reply to his antagonist, because it was needless to refute what had been already overthrown. But he brought a heavy accusation against the tendency of the Puritanical doctrines<sup>a</sup>: "Of words, Cartwright has an easy flow, and a variety; but of matter he is entirely destitute. Besides this, not only his assertions are unsound concerning the authority of Princes in sacred and ecclesiastical matters; but he is a deserter

<sup>a</sup> Life of Whitgift, by Sir G. Paul. Wordsw. Eccl. Biog. vol. iv. p. 331.

to the camp of the Papists, from whom he would seem to fly with deadly hatred. He is intolerable, not only in this matter, but in other points he borrows his weapons from the Papists."

Having thus failed in their attempts on the Queen, the Bishops, and the Parliament, some of the Puritans resolved to form a separate association. For this purpose they erected a Presbytery at Wandsworth, a village at a convenient distance from the city of London. Besides many of the ejected Ministers, the association was joined by several laymen. Eleven elders were chosen, and their offices were described in a register, entitled, "The Orders of Wandsworth." This was the first Presbyterian congregation established in England. All imaginable care was taken to keep their proceedings secret; but they could not elude the vigilance of the Court of High Commission. The Queen issued a Proclamation for enforcing the Act of Uniformity; but although the Commissioners had sufficient proof of the existence of this Presbytery, yet they could never discover who were its members.

Nothing incensed the Queen more justly against the Puritans than their invasion of the supremacy, and their dogmata concerning civil government. She resolved, therefore, to direct the full force of the penal laws against these schismatics. Letters were sent from the Lords of the Council to the Bishops, commanding them to enforce the laws, and to punish all recusants. The Lord Treasurer Burghley made a long speech before the Commissioners in the Star-chamber, in which he charged the Bishops with neglect in putting the penal laws in execution. "The Queen," he said, "thought none of her subjects entitled to protection who favoured innovation, or who countenanced the alteration of any thing established in the Church. By improper lenity, some might be inclined to think, that the exceptions of these novelists against the ceremonies of the Church were reasonable and well-

founded, or at least but trifling matters of disputation : but the Queen was resolved that her Orders and Injunctions should not be contemned ; that the public rule should be inviolably observed ; and that there should be an absolute obedience, because the safety of government depended on it."

The leaders of the Puritans being debarred the liberty of preaching and printing, challenged their adversaries to a public disputation : but the Queen and the Council would not permit the laws to be the subject of a syllogistic argument. Instead of a conference, the disputants were summoned before the Court of High Commission, to answer certain Articles alleged against them ; but not answering to the satisfaction of the Court, they were deprived.

There was yet a retreat, however limited and insecure, to which the Puritans resorted. The French and Dutch congregations, which had been dispersed under the Marian persecution, were permitted to settle in England by Elizabeth. Attempts had been made to bring them under the jurisdiction, or at least the superintendence, of the Bishop of the diocese where they were situated ; but they pleaded their charter, which vested the choice of all their governors in themselves. Grindal, while Bishop of London, exercised the office of superintendent ; but it was by their free election and consent. Taking advantage, therefore, of these privileges, some of the English Puritans gained admission into the foreign congregations : but, to prevent such abuse, an Admonition was issued from the Council to the Ministers and Elders of the Dutch congregation meeting in London. It contained an acknowledgment, that, since the beginning of Christianity, different Churches had differed in rites and ceremonies ; that in their service and devotions some stood, others kneeled, and others lay prostrate, and yet the piety and religion of all were acceptable, if they directed their prayers to the true God. The

English Church contemned not the ceremonies of foreign Churches; on the contrary, their ceremonies were worthy of approbation, as being suited to the nations where they were practised. But it was reasonable to expect that foreign Churches should shew the same deference to the Church of England, and not commit any act which might bring on them a suspicion of wishing to disturb its peace. On this account it was expected that they should not receive into their communion any natives of England who might offer to join it; and a violation of this equitable regulation might induce the Queen to dissolve their Charter, and banish them from her dominions<sup>b</sup>.

As the High Commissioners had interposed, on a former occasion, to adjust the internal dissensions of the Dutch congregation at Norwich, the congregation at London was disposed to yield an implicit obedience to their present admonition. A due acknowledgment was returned by the foreign Church for the liberty and protection which it enjoyed, with a promise to expel any native of England who might attempt to join its communion<sup>c</sup>.

The last refuge which the Puritans sought, and which, unlike the former, afforded safety, was one by which they were defended by law. They formed associations, distinguished by the name of Prophesyings of the Clergy. The Clergy were divided into classes, under a moderator appointed by the Bishop of the diocese; their meetings were held twice in a month; a sermon was preached, at which the people were allowed to be present, and, after the people were dismissed, the members of the association criticised the performance of the preacher<sup>d</sup>.

In some dioceses these prophesyings were countenanced, and even sanctioned, by the Bishops; but by Parker they

<sup>b</sup> Strype's Life of Parker, book iv. c. xxvi. p. 269.

<sup>c</sup> Strype's Annals, book i. c. xxix. p. 422.

<sup>d</sup> Neal's Hist. of the Pur. vol. i. c. v. p. 262.

were considered only as seminaries of Puritanism; and by this unfavourable representation to the Queen, the Archbishop received private instructions to suppress them. The last years of Parker's life were employed in this ungrateful and invidious work, and were imbibited by contentions with those Prelates who favoured the prophesyings. He was so intimately acquainted with the spirit and tendency of Puritanism, that he foretold its fatal effects, and predicted that the mischief would extend beyond the ruin of the hierarchy<sup>e</sup>. In one of his latest communications with his friend Burghley, he lamented the ascendancy which this sect was imperceptibly gaining in the favour of the Queen, and in the administration of the government, and that the event must be the overthrow of the Monarchy. He complained of the inconstancy of some of the Bishops, who either gave him no assistance, or endeavoured to counteract his exertions to preserve discipline. He was not so much concerned for the observance of ceremonies, as for that of the laws which enjoined these ceremonies; and added, that, if public provisions were once disregarded and treated with contempt, the government must fall. As for the Queen's ecclesiastical prerogative, though he feared that it was not so great as Burghley had stated in the Royal Injunctions, yet it was more extensive than the Papists would allow.

The death of Parker was a calamity to the Church, which could not be repaired easily; but May 17. the calamity was incalculably increased by the appointment of Grindal to the vacant Primacy: it was an un-

<sup>e</sup> "Parker, in July, 1578, told Lord Burghley, That how secure soever the nobility were of these Puritans, and countenanced them against the Bishops, they themselves might rue it at last. And that all that these men tended towards was to the overthrow of all of honourable quality, and the setting afoot a Commonwealth, or as he called it a *popularity*." Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, b. iv. c. xxxiii. p. 323.

deniable proof of the ascendancy which Parker foresaw. Grindal was a Prelate of excellent intentions, but without consistency or vigour. His imbecility of temper, rather than moderation of principle, occasioned a partial, and therefore a mischievous, relaxation of the laws; and possessing no weight in the Council, he was unable to restrain the capricious severity of the government.

Those prophesyings, which Parker had laboured with so much earnestness to suppress, Grindal exerted himself to regulate. It could not be denied that they were frequently attended with evil; that erroneous doctrines were propagated by them; and that they were promoted by such Ministers as had been deprived for contempt of discipline. Grindal thought that these evils were accidental, and not essential to the prophesyings, and therefore framed a body of laws to prevent their abuses. They had already acquired importance and stability by a code of regulations, drawn up by Cartwright and Travers with great art and ability, being designed to introduce a complete revolution in the Church, instead of a separation<sup>f</sup>. Every rule was moulded into an apparent consistency with episcopal government, while it was really subversive of the ecclesiastical polity. Every one of their Ministers was obliged to receive episcopal ordination; and though they maintained the choice of the people to be the essential call to the pastoral charge, yet they also maintained, that institution and induction into a benefice were vested in the Bishop only; but the object of their recognition of these episcopal rights was, that the Minister thus appointed might be enabled to demand his legal dues from the parish<sup>g</sup>.

Injudicious, therefore, was the attempt of Grindal to reform associations radically vicious, and to skreen them from the animadversion and hostility of the government. His injunctions, that the Ministers in these meetings should refrain from meddling with civil affairs, and that

<sup>f</sup> Neal's Hist. of the Pur. vol. i. c. vi. p. 278.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

laymen or nonconformists should be prohibited from speaking, only shewed the purity of his own views, and decidedly proved the unsoundness of his judgment.

The Queen, with superior discrimination to the Archbishop, saw the tendency of these associations, and determined to suppress them. In a personal interview with several of the Prelates, she stated that, according to information on which she could rely with confidence, the rites and ceremonies of the Church were not observed at the prophesyings; that persons not lawfully ordained officiated; and that the assemblies were in themselves illegal, not being allowed by her authority. The laity neglected their secular affairs by resorting to such assemblies, and they were calculated to raise seditions in the State, as well as schisms in the Church. It was, therefore, her determination, that the Prelates should abolish the prophesyings, and permit "no manner of Divine Service" to be performed but that which was established by law: whenever the Ministers were not sufficiently learned to preach, they were commanded to read the Homilies.

Most of the Bishops yielded a prompt obedience to the Royal Injunction, and suppressed the prophesyings within their respective dioceses; but some did it with declared reluctance, and only till they could, "by earnest prayer or humble petition," obtain the Queen's licence again to use these edifying exercises. Grindal alone had the courage to remonstrate, and though he had hitherto implicitly yielded to the will of his Sovereign, in this instance he ventured to disobey, and to express his disobedience in no very courtly language. Instead of directing his Archdeacons to carry into execution the Injunction of the Queen, he wrote a long and earnest letter. Its principal topics were the necessity and usefulness of public preaching, and the subserviency of the prophesyings to the instruction of the people. With respect to preaching, it was one of the ordinary means of salvation, and they were

taught by it piety to God and obedience to their civil governors. To read the Homilies might be useful; yet they were not to be compared to preaching, which might be suited to the diversity of times, places, and hearers, and be delivered with more efficacy and affection. Homilies were devised only to supply the want of preachers, and, by the Statute which first enjoined their use, were to give place to sermons whenever they could be procured. As to the exercises, he apprehended that they were profitable to the Church, and, in saying this, he expressed not only his own sentiments, but those of many Prelates. Several Bishops had signified that, by means of these exercises, the Clergy were better versed in the Scriptures than formerly, study and diligence were promoted, and they were a powerful antidote against Popery. He denied that such meetings were illegal; for, by the Constitutions and Canons of the Church then in force, every Bishop had authority to appoint such exercises at his discretion. Towards the close of the letter, the Archbishop took higher ground: he professed his willingness to resign his province, if it should be the Queen's pleasure; but he ventured to offer two requests: first, that the Queen would refer all ecclesiastical matters to the Bishops and Divines of the realm, according to the practice of the first Christian Emperors: secondly, that, when she handled matters of faith and religion, she would not pronounce so preremitorily as in civil matters but would remember that, in God's cause, His will, and not the will of any earthly creature, is to take place. He reminded her, that, though she was a great and mighty Princess, yet she was mortal, and accountable to God; and that, for himself, he could not, without offence of the Divine Majesty, send forth Injunctions for the suppression of those exercises<sup>h</sup>.

The Queen was highly incensed by this letter, and resolved to punish the chief governor of the Church, as

<sup>h</sup> Collier's Eccles. Hist. part ii. b. vi. p. 557.

the best method to strike terror into the rest of the Prelacy, and secure compliance with her Injunctions. By an order from the Star-chamber, Grindal was confined to his house, and sequestered from his archiepiscopal jurisdiction for six months; and, to render the punishment more severe, the sequestration was imposed as he was proceeding with his metropolitical visitation<sup>i</sup>. Before the expiration of the term assigned for his suspension, he was advised to make his submission. He complied so far as to acknowledge the clemency of the Queen, and to promise future obedience; but he could not be persuaded to retract his former opinion, or to confess sorrow for his past conduct. The imperfect submission of Grindal was deemed insufficient, his sequestration was continued till about a year before his death, and he never recovered the favour of his Sovereign.

It was now that the House of Commons began to assert its independence of the other estates of the realm, and to assume the liberty of complaint and remonstrance. In the Session of Parliament which followed the suppression of the prophesyings, the Commons voted, that as many of their members as could conveniently attend should assemble at the Temple Church, there to have preaching, and to join together in prayer, with humiliation and fasting, for the assistance of the Holy Spirit in all their consultations, and for the preservation of the Queen and her dominions<sup>k</sup>. The House adopted the cautious resolution of referring the choice of the preachers to such of its members as were of the Privy Council. Though there was nothing in this vote contrary to law, yet the Queen was no sooner advertised of it, than she sent Sir Christopher Hatton, her Vice-Chamberlain, to express her surprise and displeasure “at the rashness of the Commons, in putting into execution such an innovation, without her

<sup>i</sup> Collier's Eccles. History, part ii. b. vi. p. 571.

<sup>k</sup> Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. vi. p. 297.

pleasure being first made known to them." On receiving this message, the Court party had sufficient influence to cause the vote to be rescinded, and the House was also prevailed on to acknowledge its offence, and to promise that it should not be repeated.

Parliament being thus prohibited from appointing times of fasting and prayer, a similar injunction was given to the Clergy. Some of them, even after the suppression of the prophesyings, had ventured to agree on days of private fasting and prayer for the Queen and the Church, and of exhorting the people to repentance and reformation of life. All the Puritans who remained within the Church observed those days of private appointment; but the Queen, on receiving intimation that such unauthorized meetings were continued, determined on their suppression, as being contrary to her prerogative<sup>1</sup>. Information having been also given, that some who had benefices, and who preached weekly, neglected to administer the Holy Communion in their own persons, the Queen commanded the Bishops to inquire respecting such half-conformists as disjoined one part of their duty from the other, and to compel them, by ecclesiastical censures, to perform the whole at least twice in every year. The Puritanical Ministers being dissatisfied with the promiscuous access of all persons to the Communion, and with several passages in the Communion-Service, were sometimes induced to provide a qualified Minister, who had not their scruples, to officiate in their room. This reprehensible practice was now disallowed, and those Ministers, who would not discontinue it after admonition, were subject to deprivation.

The disaffection of the Puritans to the ecclesiastical government was no longer confined within the bounds of fair aggression, but vented itself in satirical and scurilous pamphlets. Conscientious dissent will always command forbearance, when it operates as an impediment to

<sup>1</sup> Heylin's Aerius Redivivus, p. 286.

temporal advancement: it commands more than forbearance, it compels veneration, when it leads to positive suffering or privation. But dissent, however sincere, or however well founded, loses its respectable character when provoked by persecution into bitterness of temper or extravagance of opinion. The pamphlets of the Puritans were equally deficient in decency of language and strength of argument. The unpreaching Clergy were called, in scriptural language, "dumb dogs," because, it was said, they took no pains for the instruction of their parishioners. The authors glanced at the severity of the laws, at the pride and ambition of the Bishops, at the illegal proceedings of the High Commission, and at the unjustifiable rigour of the Court.

These proceedings gave rise to a Statute providing a punishment far too severe for the offence<sup>m</sup>. It was enacted, that, if any person or persons, after forty days from the expiration of the Session, should print or publish any writing or book, tending to the defamation of the Queen's Majesty, or to the encouragement of any insurrection or rebellion, the offender, on conviction, should suffer death and loss of goods, as in cases of felony. This Statute was to continue in force only during the life of the Queen; but within that space ' sundry of the Puritans' suffered death for its transgression<sup>n</sup>.

In the same Session of Parliament another law was made, which was levelled both against the Puritans and Papists<sup>o</sup>. It was entitled, "An Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's subjects in their due obedience." By this Statute it was made treason for any Priest or Jesuit to seduce any of the Queen's subjects from the Established to the Romish religion; to be reconciled to the see of Rome was high treason; and to harbour any such offender above twenty days was misprision of treason. If any one

<sup>m</sup> St. 23 Eliz. c. 2.

<sup>n</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. vi. p. 299.

<sup>o</sup> St. 23 Eliz. c. 1.

was convicted of saying Mass, he was to forfeit one hundred marks, and to suffer a year's imprisonment. But that the Act might comprehend other nonconformists besides the Papists, it was further enacted, that all persons who did not come to church or chapel, or other place where Common Prayer was said, according to the Act of Uniformity, were to forfeit twenty pounds every month, and to suffer imprisonment until the fine was paid. Those who voluntarily absented themselves for twelve months, on certificate of their default being made in the Court of Queen's Bench, besides the common fine, were obliged to find sureties for their future good behaviour. Every schoolmaster who neglected to attend Divine Service, or who kept school without a licence from the Bishop of the diocese, was liable to a penalty of ten pounds monthly, and was to suffer a year's imprisonment.

These measures were undoubtedly arbitrary and unjust, however great might be the provocations under which they were enacted. Men who act either from passion, prejudice, or principle, are equally impenetrable by penal laws; and the Puritans, who were severally actuated by all these motives, were driven farther from conformity.

Next to the purity of her doctrines, and the vigilance of the civil government, the Church found her best security in the dissensions of her enemies. Not only the Puritans and the Papists attacked each other with fury, and mutually complained of the partiality of the Queen towards their adversaries, but the Puritanical sects displayed the greatest virulence towards each other. The most fanatical branch of the Puritans, the Brownists, not only renounced all communion with the Church in prayers and ceremonies, but in hearing the Word, and in a participation of the Sacraments. The "*Family of Love*," or the "*House of Charity*," a sect which had its origin in Holland<sup>p</sup>, and was founded by Henry Nicholas, a Dutchman, were, if

<sup>p</sup> See Hooker's Works, (Keble's Ed.) vol. i. p. 148, note.

possible, still higher enthusiasts than the Brownists: they held that election was confined to themselves, and that the rest of mankind were doomed to damnation; they also asserted the privilege of denying any thing which they pleased on oath, before a Magistrate, or any other person of a different religion. The extravagancies of these sects the sober-minded Puritans disclaimed, and reprobated with acrimony; and dissensions ensued, as fierce and implacable as those which they entertained against the object of their common enmity, the Church of England.

Though the Queen and the Bishops succeeded in excluding the Puritans from all public ministration and preaching, yet they were still received by the nobility and higher classes into their houses as chaplains or tutors: there they were permitted to expound the Scriptures, and to catechise youth. The task of education in a great degree devolved on them, and therefore it is not surprising that Puritanical tenets gained a strong hold on the minds of the rising generation.

While the Puritans were thus silently sowing that seed which was hereafter to spring into a prolific crop, the Papists were not inactive. The English Colleges at Douay and Rome sent over a swarm of Jesuits, who disseminated their devotional and controversial treatises, and employed with success the arts of proselytism. They had private conventicles in almost every town; and in the northern counties their numbers exceeded the Protestants. As a marriage was at this time contemplated between Elizabeth and the Duke of Anjou, alarms had been industriously spread that a toleration, if not an establishment, of the Romish religion would follow. To silence these reports, the Queen consented, after much importunity, to execute the penal laws against the Papists, and several Priests and Jesuits were apprehended. Campion, a Jesuit of great learning, with two other Romish Priests, named Ralph Sherwin

and Alexander Bryant, were indicted for high treason, and their conduct on their trial is a demonstration that their condemnation and subsequent execution was not an act of wanton cruelty, but of necessary precaution. The declaration of the Queen was strictly true, that she was averse from punishing her Romish subjects for the sake of conscience; but when religion was made a cloak of conspiracy and treason, then she was compelled to strike<sup>q</sup>.

It was therefore without reason that the Puritans raised an outcry against the Queen and her government, because the Romish religion was treated with undue indulgence, and even secretly encouraged, while the Puritans were sought after with jealous vigilance; for indiscriminate severity was exercised against both<sup>r</sup>. Yet such was the popular accusation; and it was set forth in glowing colours, in a supplication from the Magistrates of Suffolk to the Privy Council: "The painful Ministers of God's Word are marshalled with the worst malefactors, presented, indicted, arraigned, and condemned, for matters, as we presume, of very slender moment. A most pitiable thing it is to see the back of the law turned to the adversary, and the edge with all sharpness against the true-hearted subject." But in the petition for liberty of conscience, in which this grave accusation is contained, there was another passage, which proved that the petitioners confined this liberty within very circumscribed limits, or, in other words, to themselves: ". . . We serve the Queen and the country according to law; . . . we reverence both the law and the law-maker: Law speaketh, and we keep silence: Law commandeth, and we obey. . . . By law we proceed against all offenders; we touch none that Law spareth, we spare

<sup>q</sup> Camden's Elizabeth, p. 240.

<sup>r</sup> "Were the Jesuits more faulty in acting in *defiance* of the laws than the Puritans? I think not. They had both the same plea, Conscience; and both the same provocation, Persecution." Bp. Warburton's Remarks on Neal's History of the Puritans, Works, vol. vii.

none that Law toucheth. . . . We allow not of the Papists, their subtleties and hypocrisies; we allow not of *the family of love*, an egg of the same nest; we allow not of the Anabaptists nor of their community; we allow not of Brown, the overthrower of Church and Commonwealth: we abhor all these; no, [we] punish all these.\* Men of this description are never at a loss for a reason why other sects should be persecuted, and their own protected, and the petitioners drew the line of distinction in the following manner: "We are christened with the odious name of Puritans; a term compounded of the above-mentioned heresies, which we disclaim. The Papists pretend to be pure and immaculate; the *family of love* cannot sin, they being deified, as they say, of God. But we groan under the burden of our sins, and confess them to God; and at the same time we labour to keep ourselves and our profession unblamable. This is our Puritanism."

While Grindal lived, the springs of ecclesiastical discipline moved but heavily<sup>t</sup>. He had recovered the favour of Elizabeth so far as to be restored to his archiepiscopal functions; but a loss of sight and general infirmity disabled him from their exercise. A resignation of his dignity was, therefore, proposed and accepted; but death interposed before the instrument was executed. Of his character it is enough to say, that he has been immortalized by Spenser under the name of Algrind. [Shep. Cal. Eccl. 7.]

Whitgift, already promoted to the see of Worcester, had long been designated for the Primacy, and, on the death of Grindal, was soon confirmed in this high office. Having distinguished himself by his controversy with the Puritans, he was selected by the Queen to bring them to conformity. On his advancement she charged him to restore the discipline of the Church, which, "through the connivance of some Prelates, the obstinacy of the Puritans, and the

\* Strype's Annals, vol. iii. b. i. c. xvi. p. 266.

<sup>t</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. vi. p. 318.

power of some noblemen, was run out of square<sup>u</sup>." Whitgift obeyed the injunction with alacrity, and within the first week after his elevation, he enforced subscription to three Articles as the pre-requisite for admission into the Church. These Articles were : 1. The Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Sovereign; 2. The Lawfulness of the Common Prayer and Ordinal; 3. The Conformity of the Thirty-nine Articles to the Word of God<sup>x</sup>.

This Injunction of the new Archbishop was not published without raising a dispute concerning its legality. Some civil lawyers were of opinion that the Archbishop had no authority to impose any Articles, except under the Great Seal, and that his present proceeding was an abuse of the royal prerogative, a violation of the law, and, consequently, an act of oppression on the subject. But it was answered, in defence of Whitgift, that, by the Canon Law, a Metropolitan has a right to make regulations for the government of his province, provided they do not militate against the peace of the realm : it was also answered, that the Queen, as Head of the Church, had a right to publish Articles and Injunctions for bringing the Clergy to uniformity ; and that the Archbishop, in the present case, had acted by the Queen's direction.

The objections were not thought of sufficient weight to alter Whitgift's conduct; for, in his primary visitation, he insisted peremptorily, not only that those who were admitted to any benefice, but that those who were in possession, should subscribe the three Articles. The second, he well knew, the Puritans would refuse; and many of the Puritanical Clergy were deprived. The persevering courage of Whitgift, supported by the Queen, enabled him to resist the strong opposition by which he was encountered. Leicester and Walsingham cordially espoused

<sup>u</sup> Life of Whitgift, quoted by Neal, b. i. c. vii. p. 319.

<sup>x</sup> Subscription to these Articles was afterwards required by the Canons of 1603, Canon 36.

the cause of the Puritans, and even Burghley appeared to regard their contempt of discipline with an imperturbable complacence. The Archbishop being inflexible in refusing any abatement of discipline, Burghley proposed to the dissenters, that, since they could not conscientiously use the established Liturgy, they should frame another. This overture was joyfully accepted : a committee of Puritans sketched out a form nearly resembling the Service-book of Geneva; the outline was then submitted to a second class, who offered six hundred exceptions to it; a third class disliked the exceptions of the second, and declared for an entirely new model; a fourth class made still further refinements. When Burghley saw that they could not fix on any form of Divine Service, he assured the agents for the Puritans, that, whenever they came to any unanimous resolution, they might expect his assistance in bringing their scheme to a settlement<sup>y</sup>.

That the Puritans might have no reasonable complaint, Whitgift consented to hold a conference with some of their disaffected Ministers. The Archbishop associated with himself Cooper, Bishop of Winchester, to answer the objections of Sparke and Travers against the Book of Common Prayer. A conference took place on the subject at Lambeth, in the presence of the Earl of Leicester, Lord Grey, and Sir Francis Walsingham. With the greatest urbanity, the Archbishop encouraged these two dissidents to state their grievances, not as being judicially summoned for disobedience to established ordinances, but as voluntarily met for the purpose of a fair and friendly discussion. Instead of proceeding directly to the subject, Sparke replied, that as the good issue of the conference depended upon the favour of God, he desired, before they entered on the argument, to seek the gracious direction and blessing of God by prayer. And with this request, placing himself in a suitable posture, he was about to pray, when

<sup>y</sup> Collier's Eccl. Hist. part ii. b. vii. p. 17.

the Archbishop interrupted him, saying, that he should make no prayers there, nor turn the room into a conventicle. Travers joined with Sparke in requesting licence to pray; but the Earl of Leicester requested them to desist, since there was no doubt that they had said their prayers before they came thither. Sparke complied so far as to omit the long prayer which he had originally intended to use, but persevered in offering a short address to God, throughout which he was continually interrupted by the Archbishop<sup>z</sup>.

The conference was resumed on a second day, and it terminated in the dissatisfaction of both parties. The Puritanical Ministers were not convinced, and the Archbishop was confirmed in his resolution of enforcing conformity. But the Noblemen who were present at the conference were constrained to acknowledge, that they could not otherwise have believed the reasoning of the Archbishop to be so strong, and the objections of his opponents to be so weak and trivial<sup>a</sup>.

In the same proportion as the Puritans were discomfited by legitimate argument, their virulence increased. There was a book in high repute among them, entitled, "The Holy Discipline of the Church, described in the Word of God." This treatise was originally written in Latin by Travers; but it had been submitted to the revisal of Cartwright, and by him had been translated into English. It contained the substance of those alterations in discipline for which the Puritans contended; it was the standard to which they appealed, and which they aimed at establishing by the intervention of the civil power.

<sup>z</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. vii. p. 343.

<sup>a</sup> Life of Whitgift by Sir Geo. Paul. Strype, in his Life of Whitgift, (book iii. c. viii. p. 170. Lond. 1718.) says, that the Puritanical Ministers were convinced by this conference: but this assertion is justly questioned by Neal, because Travers continued a non-conformist to his death, and Sparke appeared at the Hampton Court conference on the side of the Dissenters.

The Puritans, having experienced in a former Parliament the favourable disposition of the House of Commons, prosecuted their design of effecting a reformation through that body. Their agents were employed in soliciting the Members even at the doors of the House, and when the House was risen, in renewing their importunities at the habitations of different individuals. Soon after the commencement of the Session, three petitions were offered to the House in favour of the Dissenters. A motion was also made, that the Book of Discipline should be read, with a view to its enactment; but the motion being opposed by Sir Francis Knolles, seconded

1585 by Sir Christopher Hatton, the book was not suffered to be read<sup>b</sup>. The petitions were reduced into sixteen Articles, and presented by the Commons to the House of Lords; but the opinion of the Lords was delivered briefly by the Lord Treasurer, and at great length by the Archbishop of York, against any further discussion of such matters. Burghley stated that, in the judgment of the House, many of the Articles were unnecessary, for others provision was already made, and that uniformity in Divine Service was already settled by Parliament.

It was not thought sufficient by the Prelates to reject these Articles in the House of Lords; for Cooper, Bishop of Winchester, refuted them in a treatise. The five first Articles, he observed, related to the insufficiency of Ministers, and the reformation of an unlearned Ministry: yet, though there might be some instances of incompetence, there never was less reason for complaint; and there was still a progress towards improvement. The sixth Article demanded, that all Pastors might be tried and approved by their respective parishes: but such a mode of appointment had long since been abrogated as pernicious in itself, and as being an infringement of the rights of patronage. The five succeeding Articles complained of the oath and sub-

<sup>b</sup> D'Ewes's Journal, p. 357.

scription required by the Archbishop, of ecclesiastical censures, and of the abuses of the High Commission Court: but if these demands were granted, the hierarchy and the civil government would be overthrown. The twelfth Article proposed the establishment of exercises and conferences, under the control of the Ordinary: but these services had been already tried, and for good reasons had been suppressed. The two next Articles related to excommunication; which, it was contended, ought not to be pronounced for light offences, and not by laymen: these evils, it was candidly acknowledged, ought to be redressed. The last Articles regarded pluralities and non-residence: but these were defended on account of the small value of many ecclesiastical benefices.

So powerful, however, was the interest of the Dissenters in the House of Commons, that a Bill was introduced for the regulation of pluralities, the correction of non-residence, and for appeals against Ecclesiastical Courts. This interference in ecclesiastical discipline attracted the attention of Whitgift: he drew up his reasons against the Bill, and prevailed with the Convocation to present them to the Queen in the form of an address. The Bill was represented to be an invasion of the royal prerogative; and while it lessened the revenues of the Crown, infringed the rights of private patronage. Of its consequences it was predicted, that such a Statute would be a prejudice to learning, would introduce a base and unlearned Clergy, and would be an encouragement to students to go to foreign Universities, where they might obtain a better provision; and, in a word, would make way for anarchy and confusion<sup>c</sup>. But to shew that the Convocation was not indisposed to redress fair and just grievances, six Articles, relating principally to the abuses of Ecclesiastical Courts were presented to the Queen as the sum of necessary reformation.

<sup>c</sup> Life of Whitgift, book iii. c. xvi. p. 487. and Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. vii. p. 363.

While the Convocation was thus employed, the Bill against Pluralities passed the House of Commons, and was sent up to the Lords. There the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, with the Bishop of Winchester, opposed the Bill with the same energy as in Convocation. They argued, that neither the Universities nor Cathedrals could subsist without pluralities; and, to prove their assertion, a list of ecclesiastical livings was produced, whose revenues were utterly insufficient for the support of a resident incumbent. The weight of the Bishops being joined with that of the Court, the Bill was rejected.

The Commons were so highly exasperated by this failure, that they ordered several other Bills to be introduced subservient of Episcopacy. One was for imposing an oath on all Bishops, to be taken in the Court of Chancery or Queen's Bench, not to do any act contrary to the laws of the land. Another Bill was aimed at the reduction of fees; a third was for liberty to marry at all times of the year; a fourth, for the qualification of Ministers; and a fifth, for the restoration of discipline. The Bill for the qualification of Ministers annulled all Popish Ordinations, and disqualified all who were incapable of preaching, as well as all who were convicted of profaneness or immorality. It insisted on an examination of Candidates for the Ministry by the Bishop, assisted by twelve laymen, and made the consent, if not the election, of the people necessary to induction into any pastoral charge. The Bill for the restoration of Discipline went to abolish the Canon Law and all Spiritual Courts, and to bring all testamentary and matrimonial causes into Westminster Hall. It proposed to constitute a Presbytery or Eldership in every parish, which was to determine the spiritual causes arising within its district, with a reservation of appeal to higher judicatories.

When the Bill for the qualification of Ministers had passed the House of Commons, Whitgift thought it incumbent on him to interpose, and to stay its progress

by a remonstrance to the Queen. He therefore wrote an earnest address, reminding her, that the discussion of ecclesiastical matters in the Lower House, without her permission, had been already prohibited, and was now carried on in defiance of her injunctions. The Bill which the Commons had just passed was equally repugnant to sound reason and ecclesiastical discipline; and this Bill was only a prelude to others tending to overthrow the Constitution<sup>d</sup>.

This letter either found or made the Queen of the same opinion with its author, and the advice of Whitgift was seldom urged in vain. A message from the Throne was immediately sent to the House of Commons, severely reprehending them "for attempting what she had forbidden." The Speaker was commanded to see that no Bills touching reformation in causes ecclesiastical should be exhibited, and if any such were exhibited, she commanded him on his allegiance not to suffer them to be read.

The Queen in her speech to the two Houses, at the prorogation of Parliament, adverted to the late proceedings. She noticed the disposition of some persons to blame the Clergy; but added, that a censure of this kind reflected on herself. Since God had made her an over-ruler of the Church, her negligence could not be excused if any schism or heresy was encouraged: concluding in these words; "Thus much I must say, that some faults and negligences may grow and be, as in all other great charges it happeneth, and what vocation without? All which, if you my Lords of the Clergy do not amend, I mean to depose you. Look ye therefore well to your charges e."

<sup>d</sup> Fuller's Church Hist. b. ix. p. 86.

<sup>e</sup> D'Ewes's Journal, p. 328. and Strype's Whitgift, p. 199.

## CHAPTER XIX.

Application of the Puritans to the Convocation and to Whitgift, for Relief.—Dangers to the Government.—Spanish Armada.—Conduct of the Papists and Puritans.—Martin Marprelate.—Answers by Bridges and Cooper.—New Parliament.—Severe penal Laws passed.—Of the Barrowists, and the Execution of their Leaders.—Penry's Character and Death.—Writings of the English Divines against Puritanism.—HOOKER'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

WHILE the Puritans were urging their solicitations on the House of Commons, they did not neglect to bring their grievances before the Convocation. An Address was presented in the name of those Ministers who had refused to subscribe the three Articles promulgated by the Archbishop. These Ministers desired at least to be satisfied with respect to their scruples, a satisfaction which had not hitherto been attempted<sup>f</sup>. The Convocation having rejected their Petition, the Ministers printed their “Apology to the Church, and Humble Suit to the High Court of Parliament.” In this performance they repeated the common objections against the Liturgy, and concluded with an earnest request that they might be continued in their cures. As they had been set apart to the sacred Ministry, they considered themselves to be bounden to God and their flocks; they professed their readiness to submit to any ordinance which was not sinful, because they apprehended that the “shepherds being stricken, their flocks would be scattered<sup>g</sup>.”

After these fruitless solicitations to the Parliament and the Convocation, the Puritans importuned the Archbishop separately to exert his interest with the Queen for an abatement in the terms of conformity. A short tract was also published, containing “Means to settle a Godly and Charitable Quietness in the Church,” humbly addressed

<sup>f</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. vii. p. 327.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

to the Primate. Whitgift never spared any personal exertion when he could be useful, and his living cares as his dying wishes were for the Church of God. With great assiduity and skill he framed an answer to the treatise, in which he informed the petitioners, that it was not his business to alter or to dispense with the ecclesiastical laws, but to see that they were duly observed. On one of the propositions submitted by the non-conforming Ministers, he commented with his usual acuteness. It was proposed, that those Ministers who had been suspended for their refusal to subscribe the Articles might be restored to their benefices, on condition of giving a bond or security not to preach against the Hierarchy, or to disturb the peace of the Church; but, on the contrary, to uphold both, as far as they consistently and conscientiously were able. To this proposal, specious but hollow, Whitgift replied, that he was not averse from receiving such a bond; but added the following unanswerable observation: “He that shall enter into a bond, and yet refuse to subscribe, in my opinion is either a mere hypocrite or a very wilful fellow; for *this* condition containeth more than doth the subscription<sup>b</sup>. ”

These divisions, as it was reasonable to expect, were converted by the Papists to their advantage, and a plot was at this time formed for the assassination of the Queen. The principal contriver of the conspiracy was Lord Paget, who escaped by flight as soon as his treason was discovered; while one Parry, who was to have been the instrument of this treason, was executed<sup>i</sup>.

The Parliament which met after the discovery of this conspiracy, sensible of the calamities which must happen to the nation by the death of the Queen, entered into a voluntary association to revenge it, if it should take place by violence. They also enacted a severe

<sup>b</sup> Bp. Maddox's *Vind.* against Neal, p. 348.

<sup>i</sup> Strype's *Annals*, vol. iii. b. i. c. xx. and xxi.

Statute against Jesuits and Priests of foreign Seminaries, or any others who should engage in plots, by virtue of the Bull of excommunication of Pope Pius the Fifth, and against any English subject who should go to the foreign popish Seminaries for education.

The trial and execution of the unfortunate Queen 1587 of Scotland, have thrown a shade over the character of Elizabeth which it is impossible to dispel, and even her vindicators have been constrained to acknowledge, that her conduct had in it more of policy than justice, and more of spleen than policy. The impartial judgment of Camden has attributed this tragical catastrophe to the excessive anxiety of the Protestants for the safety of Elizabeth, as it was connected with their religion, and to the intrigues of the Papists, eager to reduce England under the jurisdiction of the See of Rome. Mary was the last hope of the Romanists, and their extinction of hope was succeeded, not by despondency, but by rebellion.

The Parliament did not separate without another effort on the part of the Puritans to obtain relief, or more properly an establishment<sup>k</sup>. The House of Commons also, not intimidated by its former defeat, revived the Bill for farther reformation. A new Book of Common Prayer was proposed for the sanction of parliamentary authority; and the reformed Liturgy, while it contained a prescribed form to be used before and after the Sermon, left to the officiating minister the liberty of varying it according to his discretion. The Article in the Creed on the descent of Christ into hell was altered, and three out of the Thirty-nine Articles established by Elizabeth were omitted. Besides the change in the Liturgy, the Bill provided for the total abolition of the ecclesiastical courts: the spiritual jurisdiction was to be placed in the hands of an assembly of ministers and elders in every county, which assembly was empowered to examine, approve, and present ministers

<sup>k</sup> Bp. Warburton's Remarks on Neal's Hist. Works, vol. vii. p. 896.

to the several parishes for their sanction, and were to depose them, with consent of the Bishop, for misconduct<sup>1</sup>.

Some bold speeches were made in the House against the proceedings of the Bishops, and particularly by Wentworth, who, unmindful of his former punishment, provoked its repetition. Together with some other members, he was sent to the Tower, at which act of severity the House was so greatly intimidated, that the reading of the Bill was postponed. The Queen commanded the Petition of the Puritans and the Bill before the House to be withdrawn, and sent a message to the Commons by their Speaker, that she was already settled in her religion, and would not begin again; that changes in religion were dangerous; that it was not reasonable for the Commons to call in question the established faith, while others were endeavouring to overthrow it; that she had considered the objections, and found that they were frivolous; and that the Platform of Discipline, which the Puritans wished to establish, was prejudicial to her Crown and the peace of her government. So highly incensed was the Queen with the attempts of the Puritans, at the crisis of an expected invasion from Spain, that, in the customary Act of general pardon passed at the end of the Session, she commanded an exception to be made of such as committed any offence against the Act of Uniformity, or were convicted of publishing seditious books and pamphlets.

The Convocation, contrary to its general usage, continued to sit after the Parliament had risen, and granted a liberal subsidy to the Queen in aid of the war against the popish powers of Europe. Impressed with a conviction that the Church was in far greater danger from the Puritans, the two Houses addressed the Queen, offering to maintain by disputation that the Puritanical Platform of Discipline was absurd in theology, and dangerous in politics.

<sup>1</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. vii. p. 384.

Never was the government of Elizabeth and the Church of England in greater danger than at this period; and it might be thought that the impending invasion of the King of Spain would, for a time, avert the attention of all parties from their internal dissensions, and direct their hostility against their common foe. Though the Armada, vauntingly styled invincible, was confessedly prepared to bring England back to the Catholic faith, and though the Romanists in England composed a formidable body<sup>m</sup>, yet Elizabeth found that her most dangerous enemies were not among her Romish subjects. In this time of common danger, the Puritans forgot their antipathy to the Papists, and were indefatigable in dispersing libels against the Church and her Prelates<sup>n</sup>. If the Spanish fleet had succeeded in effecting a descent, the consequences might have been fatal to English liberty; but by the opposition of the elements, and the valour of the English navy, not a single Spaniard set his foot on English ground, and not a single Spanish ship was left entire to carry back the intelligence of the disgraceful defeat.

In the time of national danger, the Puritans had pleaded for privileges and indulgences as the price of their uniting against a foreign enemy; and no sooner was the danger past, than they renewed their applications for the subversion of the Hierarchy. If there were any part of the govern-

<sup>m</sup> Cardinal Allen computed the number of Romanists in England, at this time, to be two-thirds of the whole population; a computation of which it is needless to prove the error.—Lingard's History, vol. viii. c. 5. p. 330.

<sup>n</sup> Camden's Elizabeth, p. 374. “Why, wanting your desires, wold you have taken no part if the Spaniard had come? Or purposed you to haue made a more readie passage for him by rebelling at home before he should haue come? Or would you haue ioined with him, if he had come? Or meant you thereby, through terror, to have enforced her Majestie to your purposes, lest you should have taken some of these courses? Choose which of them you list: the best is seditious.” Bancroft's Dangerous Positions, b. iv. c. 3.

ment of Elizabeth which deserves reprobation, it was her invasion of the liberty of the press. This being denied to the Puritans, while it was enjoyed in a limited degree by the Papists<sup>o</sup>, Puritanical hostility was no longer confined within the bounds of legitimate discussion and fair argument, but vented itself in clandestine libels, replete with scurrility and rancour.

The theological press being under the control of Whitgift, it was needless for the Puritans to solicit a licence; they purchased a private press, which they transported from one county to another to prevent discovery. It was first set up at Moulsey, in the county of Surrey, and after having been removed to many different towns, was at length conveyed to Manchester. There it was found by the officers of government; but not till it had completed its destructive work, by multiplying the productions of seditious fanaticism, which its partisans took care to disseminate. The greater part of these libels are consigned to an oblivion from which no historian of any sect or party would willingly rescue them; but there is one which is the subject of occasional allusion to point a period, and the name of Martin Marprelate is still familiar as the prototype of Puritanical rancour. This violent satire against the Hierarchy was written, as it is supposed, by a junto of separatists, for its real authors were never ascertained. Its language was as rude and unbecoming as its spirit was fierce and unchristian.

1589 The Queen, on the publication of this pamphlet, commanded the Archbishop to make a diligent in-

<sup>o</sup> Neal accuses Whitgift of giving a licence to Ascanio, an Italian merchant and bookseller in London, to import what Popish books he thought fit; but it has been shewn that the licence was granted on strict conditions, which Ascanio entered into a bond with sureties to fulfil. These books were not to be dispersed, but to be delivered to one of the Privy Council for a previous examination.—Bp. Maddox's *Vind.* p. 350.

quiry after the printing-press whence it issued, and accompanied her injunction with a Proclamation for calling in all seditious and schismatical books, whether printed or written. These books were described in the Proclamation as “tending to bring in a monstrous and dangerous innovation, in all manner of ecclesiastical government now in use, of the three ancient Estates of the Realm under her Highness, whereof her Majesty mindeth to have a reverend regard.” All her loving subjects were, therefore, prohibited from having any such books in their custody, her Majesty being minded to have the laws severely executed against the authors and abettors of them, as soon as they were apprehended.

When the printing-press was discovered which gave birth to Martin Marprelate, the Archbishop wrote to the Lord Treasurer to institute a prosecution against those persons in whose possession it was found. He recommended that this prosecution should be conducted by the Lords of the Council, rather than by the High Commissioners, because they had already incurred great unpopularity for their support of the government in Church and State<sup>p</sup>. Accordingly, those who procured the press, together with the printer and publisher of the libels, were imprisoned by order of the Council, and amerced with heavy fines<sup>q</sup>. Though Whitgift was accused of instigating most of the severities of this reign against ecclesiastical delinquents, yet his conduct in the present instance shewed a different spirit. He improved his interest with the Queen, and persevered in his intercession till the offenders were released from prison, and their fines remitted. This

<sup>p</sup> Life of Whitgift by Strype, b. iii. c. xxiii. p. 602.

<sup>q</sup> Neal says, “Among the divines who suffered death for these libels was Mr. Udal;” as if he had been put to death by the hands of the executioner: whereas he died in prison, probably, but not certainly, from grief. Bishop Warburton has reprehended this language with due severity. Remarks on Neal, Works, vol. vii. p. 898.

noble conduct, at any other period, would have received its merited commendation; but in an age when the principles of religious toleration were practised by no party, it was liable to misconstruction. It was imputed by many “to the declining of envy, gaining of applause, and remorse of conscience for over-rigorous proceedings.... Thus impossible is it to please froward spirits, and to make them like the best deed who dislike the doer thereof.” Cartwright was among the number of those who were imprisoned for these seditious libels, and was indebted for his liberation to the interference of Whitgift. On a promise of quiet and peaceable behaviour, this celebrated non-conformist was restored, not only to his liberty, but to his preferment; he was reinstated in his hospital, where he continued without farther molestation during the remainder of his life. He acknowledged the generosity of Whitgift, and admitted “his bond of duty to the Archbishop to be so much the straiter as it was without any desert of his own<sup>s</sup>.”

Whitgift, in exerting his interest with the Queen for mitigating the punishment which the Puritans had incurred, thought that he had performed only half of his duty: he was careful that the calumnies which they had propagated should be detected and exposed. The libel of Martin Marprelate was answered in a ludicrous style by Bridges, afterwards Bishop of Oxford; but Cooper, Bishop of Winchester, rendered “more service by his grave and sober reply<sup>t</sup>.” In performing the task, Cooper derived essential assistance from the Archbishop, who, being shame-

<sup>r</sup> Fuller's Church History, b. ix. p. 132.

<sup>s</sup> Life of Whitgift, by Sir G. Paul. In his latter years, Cartwright became a controversialist in behalf of the Church of England, and expressed his concern for the schism which he had caused.

<sup>t</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. viii. p. 403. Cooper was answered in a pamphlet, entitled “Ha' ye any Work for the Cooper?” And in a second, “More Work for the Cooper.”

fully aspersed, furnished replies to the particular charges brought against him.

The cause of Puritanism suffered from these scurrilous libels, and it was still more sensibly injured by its connexion with some blasphemous enthusiasts, who appeared at this time. These were, the notorious Hacket, with his two prophets, Arthington and Coppinger. Hacket was not less ignorant than seditious and profane; he was unable even to read: but he pretended to be King Jesus, and to set up his own empire in England instead of the existing sovereignty. He defaced the royal arms, and stabbed the Queen's picture with a dagger in the house where he lodged. Being apprehended and put upon the rack, he made a full confession; and on his trial pleaded his guilt, declaring that he was instigated by the Spirit. The execution of his sentence followed, and his conduct at his death displayed insanity. Coppinger starved himself in prison; but Arthington lived to recover his senses, and was pardoned. The most popular, though not the most candid historian of these times, [Fuller,] has endeavoured to exculpate the Puritans from any share in this mixture of rebellion and blasphemy: but he has confessed, that the business happened unseasonably for the Presbyterians. He boldly avers, that "they detested his blasphemies as cordially as the Episcopal party: and such of them as loved Hacket the non-conformist, abhorred Hacket the heretic, after he had mounted to so high a pitch of impiety." But the charge of participation in rebellion was not at the time so easily cleared. Cartwright thought it necessary to write an elaborate apology for himself and his brethren, disclaiming all connexion with these enthusiasts: but his arguments and explanations were unsatisfactory to all but his own party.

At the opening of the new Parliament, the Queen signified her pleasure to the House of Commons, that they might redress such civil grievances as were complained of

in their respective counties; but must leave all matters of the State to herself and the Council, and all matters of the Church to herself and the Bishops. This was not a mandate which might be disobeyed with impunity. Wentworth and Bromley having moved the House to address the Queen, praying her to name a successor, were both committed to prison, where Wentworth remained several years<sup>u</sup>. When a motion was made, that the Queen should be solicited to release the imprisoned members, it was answered by those of the House who were Privy Counsellors, that the Queen having committed them for causes best known to herself, the House could not call her to account for what she did by her own authority, and that it was highly unbecoming to discuss such matters.

Where there was so little licence granted to the Commons in treating affairs of State, it was “a bold adventure of Morrice, Attorney of the Court of Wards, to move an inquiry into the proceedings of the Bishops in their Spiritual Courts<sup>x</sup>.” He said, that the Bishops could not justify their proceedings, their inquisition, their subscriptions, their binding the Queen’s subjects contrary to the laws of God and the realm, their compelling men to take oaths in crimination of themselves, and, on refusal, degrading, depriving, and imprisoning them at pleasure, and not releasing them till they had complied. At the same time, when he uttered this strong invective, he submitted two Bills to the House, one against the oath *ex officio*, and the other against illegal imprisonment. Having moved that the last Bill be read immediately, Sir Francis Knollys seconded the motion, and said, that in his opinion these abuses ought to be reformed. He added, that after the Reformation of Henry the Eighth, no Bishop exercised a superiority over his brethren; that in the reign of Edward

<sup>u</sup> Heylin’s Aerius Redivivus, p. 319. D’Ewes’s Journal of the House of Commons, p. 470.

<sup>x</sup> Strype’s Life of Whitgift, b. iv. c. viii. p. 121.

the Sixth a Statute was enacted, obliging the Bishops to hold their Courts in the King's name; and although this Statute was repealed by Queen Mary, and not since revived, yet it was doubtful whether the Bishops had authority to hold their Courts in their own name, because this was a manifest usurpation on the royal prerogative, and because no subject could legally hold a Court without a licence from the Crown. If it were argued, that the Bishops held their Courts by prescription, or by the Statute of Henry the Eighth, which gave to the Bishops the same authority under the King which they had possessed under the Pope, he answered, that there was a clause in the Act which restrained them from invading the King's prerogative, and the laws and customs of the realm. But another member followed on the same side, and added, that the Bishops had transgressed the law, because the Statute of Elizabeth required subscription to Articles of faith only; that this limitation was made by the Lords after the Bill had passed the Commons; and that no Councils or Canons gave authority to the Bishops to frame Articles, and to require subscriptions at their pleasure.

These speeches called up the civilians of the House, and particularly Daulton, who opposed the reading of the Bill, because the Queen had often prohibited the Commons from meddling with the affairs of the Church; a fact which the House too well knew. As soon as the Queen was informed of the purport of the debate, she sent for Coke, the Speaker, and commanded him to declare to the House that it was wholly in her power to determine, to assent, and to dissent, with regard to any thing done in Parliament; that her intention, in calling the present Parliament, was only that God might be more religiously served, and that those who neglected His service might be compelled to reformation by some severe laws, and also that the safety of her person and her realm might be secured.

It was not in her intention that the Commons should interfere in matters of State or ecclesiastical causes, and she wondered that they should attempt a thing contrary to her Injunctions. It was her pleasure that the two Bills before the House should be withdrawn; and if any Bill concerning ecclesiastical matters should hereafter be exhibited, “upon my allegiance,” said the Speaker, “I am commanded not to read it.”

The members who had distinguished themselves by their bold speeches on the popular side felt the weight of the royal displeasure. Beal was forbidden to come within the verge of the Court, and was commanded to absent himself from the Parliament. Morrice was apprehended in the House by a serjeant-at-arms, discharged from his office in the Court of the Duchy of Lancaster, disabled from practising in his profession, and confined for some years in Tutbury castle.

A Parliament in which freedom of speech was proscribed<sup>z</sup>, and which submitted to such a restraint, was easily persuaded to pass one of the most severe Statutes on record. It enacts the punishment of persons obstinately refusing to come to church, and persuading others to impugn the Queen’s authority in ecclesiastical causes<sup>a</sup>. By this law, any person above the age of sixteen years who should obstinately refuse to repair to some place of public worship, according to the use of the Church of England, for the space of one month, without lawful cause, or should, “by printing, writing, or express words,” endeavour to persuade any of the Queen’s subjects to

<sup>y</sup> D’Ewes’s Journal, p. 474.

<sup>z</sup> To the customary request by the speaker Coke, for liberty of speech, the Lord Keeper answered, in the Queen’s name, “Priviledge of speech is granted; but you must know what priviledge you have: not to speak every one what he listeth, or what cometh in his brain to utter that: but your priviledge is I or No.” D’Ewes’s Journal of the House of Lords, p. 460.

<sup>a</sup> St. 35 Elizabeth, c. 1.

deny or resist her power and authority in ecclesiastical causes, or should dissuade them from coming to church, or should be present at any unlawful conventicle, under colour or pretext of the exercise of religion; the person thus offending, being lawfully convicted, was subjected to imprisonment until he conformed himself to the laws, and made an humble acknowledgment of his past offence, and gave a promise of future obedience. And in case the offender obstinately refused to submit, and to sign the acknowledgment within three months after conviction, he was obliged to abjure the realm<sup>b</sup>.

The moderate Puritans contrived to evade the force of this Statute by coming to church when the Prayers were almost concluded, and by receiving the Communion in those churches where it was not administered in strict conformity with the Rubric and Canons. But the full weight of this penal law was felt by those separatists, who had renounced all communion with the Church, in preaching, and in the Sacraments, as well as in the celebration of Divine Service. Those violent separatists, who have been already noticed under the name of Brownists, had lately assumed the title of Barrowists, from one Barrow, a gentleman of the Temple, who was become their leader. The distinguishing tenets of this sect have been described; and their members had greatly increased since they had been abandoned by their original founder. Sir Walter Raleigh stated in the House of Commons, that there were not less than twenty thousand, divided into several congregations, in Norfolk, Essex, and the vicinity of London.

The congregation in London had procured a place of worship, and had elected proper officers for the government of the congregation. Their form of worship, and of administering the Sacraments, were distinguished by some

<sup>b</sup> A similar Statute was enacted against Popish recusants, by which they were confined within five miles of their respective dwellings. St. 35 Eliz. c. 2.

peculiarities deserving notice. The Sacrament of Baptism was administered without sponsors, the practice of immersion was abolished, the Minister washing the face of the person baptized, and pronouncing the customary words. The Lord's Supper was administered in the following manner: five white loaves being placed on the table, the Pastor invoked the Divine blessing, after which, having broken the bread, he delivered it to the Deacons, and the Deacons distributed it among the congregation. The posture of the communicants was that of standing or sitting round the table, but the form of words accompanying the distribution differed little from that used by the Church of England<sup>c</sup>.

This congregation being obliged to meet in different places, in order to escape the vigilance of government, was at length discovered in Islington, in the very same place where a Protestant congregation had assembled in the reign of Queen Mary. A large number was immediately apprehended, and sent to different prisons. At their examination they confessed that they had been accustomed to assemble to pray and expound the Scriptures, and vindicated themselves for separating from the Church of England. Some of the prisoners submitted their case to the Privy Council; but their petition contained so many intemperate reflections on the hierarchy that it received no answer. They next addressed the Lord Treasurer Burghley, but with as little success. A few of these unfortunate men, after having suffered a long imprisonment, were executed for writing and publishing seditious books, among whom were Barrow and Greenwood, who, at the place of execution, professed piety to God, and loyalty to their Sovereign.

Not long after the execution of Barrow, John Penry, or Ap-Henry, a Welsh divine, suffered in the same manner; the circumstances of whose life are too remarkable to be

<sup>c</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. viii. p. 437.

passed over. His learning was not contemptible, but he was equally deficient in judgment and in temper. He had preached in both Universities with approbation, and afterwards travelling into Wales, was the first, as he said, that preached the Gospel publicly to the Welsh, and sowed the good seed among his countrymen. His earliest publications were, a "View of such Public Wants and Disorders as are in Her Majesty's Country of Wales, with an Humble Petition to the High Court of Parliament for Redress;" and, "An Exhortation to the Governors and People of Her Majesty's Country of Wales to have the Preaching of the Gospel planted among them."

When Martin Marprelate, and the other satirical pamphlets against the Bishops were published, a special warrant issued from the Privy Council to apprehend Penry, as an enemy to the State. To avoid being taken, he retired into Scotland, and in that country employed his time in framing a petition, or rather an address, to the Queen, on the state of religion. Its design was to shew that Elizabeth was ignorant of the many abuses in the Church of England, and an intercession for her permission to preach the Gospel in his native country. The language of this address was not calculated to gain the favour which he solicited, and one passage must be quoted as a specimen of its offensive style: "Among the rest of the Princes under the Gospel who have been drawn in to oppose it, you must consider yourself to be one; for until you see this, you see not yourself; and they are but sycophants and flatterers whoever tell you otherwise. The practice of your government shews, that if you could have lived without the Gospel, it would have been doubtful whether the Gospel should have been established or not; for now that you are established on your throne by the Gospel, you suffer it to reach no farther than the end of your sceptre limiteth unto it."

When he had finished this address, he brought it with

him from Scotland, resolving, if he should find an opportunity, to deliver it to the Queen with his own hand: but, on his arrival in London, he was seized, and his manuscripts were subjected to a severe scrutiny. From these manuscripts, and other papers found in his possession, were drawn his articles of accusation. He was indicted for uttering seditious words and rumours against the Queen, tending to stir up rebellion among her subjects, a crime which, by the late Statute, amounted to felony. It was at first designed to indict him for his printed books; but, by the advice of his council, he delivered in court a remonstrance, shewing that he was not in danger of the law for any books published in his name. He observed, that the late Statute was not intended against such as only wrote against the hierarchy, for then it must condemn many of the most learned Protestants at home and abroad, but against such as defamed the royal authority. This he had not done; but his writings were loyal, as his deportment was that of an obedient subject. The court, apprehending that this remonstrance might occasion a legal argument, which would ultimately turn to the advantage of the prisoner, set aside his printed books, and convicted him on the petition and the unpublished papers found in his possession. Such a proceeding, being manifestly illegal, gave rise to an eloquent and affecting appeal on the part of the prisoner. The Lord Treasurer Burghley, to whom it was addressed, could never have read the following passage without emotion: “The cause is most lamentable, that the private observations of any student, being in a foreign land, and wishing well to his Prince and country, should bring his life, with blood, to a violent end; especially seeing they are most private, and so imperfect, as they have no coherence at all in them, and in most places carry no true English.—Though my innocence may stand me in no stead before an earthly tribunal, yet I know that I shall have the reward thereof before the judgment-seat

of the Great King; and the merciful Lord, who relieves the widow and the fatherless, will reward my desolate orphans and friendless widow that I leave behind me, and even hear their cry; for He is merciful."

In the protestation inclosed in this letter, he declared that he wrote his observations in Scotland; that they were the substance of certain objections made by persons, which he intended to examine, and perhaps to refute; that even in those writings, so unfinished, and intended only for private use, he had shewn his dutifulness to the Queen, and had never entertained even a secret wandering thought of disloyalty.

Whatever opinion may be entertained of the credibility of these assertions, when compared with his overt acts, and with the tendency of his writings; yet the illegality of his conviction cannot be disproved, nor the harsh treatment justified, which he experienced on his trial, and even at his execution. While he was at dinner, he received a message from the Sheriff, commanding him to hold himself in readiness, for he must die that afternoon. Accordingly he was carried in a cart to the place where he was to suffer, and was not permitted to speak to the people, to make any profession of his faith in God, or of his loyalty to his Prince.

The execution of these Brownists, uniting sedition with fanaticism, appears to have wrought a change in the temper of the government. Their professions of piety and loyalty, however insincere or fallacious, when uttered in their dying moments, excited the compassion of the people for their sufferings. The Court of High Commission incurred no small portion of resentment, and the Queen herself expressed displeasure at its arbitrary rigour. A resolution was therefore adopted: instead of punishing the Puritans with death, to send them into banishment<sup>d</sup>.

It is gratifying to turn from the penal laws of Elizabeth,

<sup>d</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. viii. p. 443.

instruments which are always ineffectual in suppressing or in propagating truth, but through which error often derives strength and perpetuity. It is still more gratifying, that the attention can now be directed to the only fair and successful warfare against error, that which was maintained by the Divines of the Church of England against Puritanism. Its extravagant and pernicious tenets gave rise to those vindications of Protestant episcopacy, which the Puritans of this age could not answer, and which are regarded by subsequent ages as models of theological controversy.

The indefatigable zeal and the literary productions of Whitgift have been already mentioned with that approbation which they deserve; and they will be read with interest and profit. They are an evidence of a vigorous mind, acute in detecting the sophistry, and unsparing in exposing the fallacious but seductive rhetoric, of his adversaries. Bancroft possessed a more popular style than Whitgift, and a high degree of that impassioned oratory in which the Puritans excelled. In the pulpit of St. Paul's Cross he gave a glowing, but not an overcharged, description of Puritanism ; shewing its tendency to overturn the monarchy as well as the hierarchy, and forcibly appealing to such of the aristocracy as encouraged Puritanical principles, whether they would willingly have these principles carried to their full extent? At the time when the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel had neither silver nor gold, and were persecuted from city to city, their wealthy converts sold their estates, and laid the money at the feet of these poor and persecuted Apostles. Poverty and humility are not to be practised by the teachers of religion alone, but are obligatory in an equal degree on all Christians. Of those who wished to revive the practice of the Apostolic age, the preacher pertinently inquired, how they would like a community of goods ? If they were unwilling that such a doctrine should be practised on themselves, they should be cautious how they urged it against the Clergy.

The arguments which Bancroft urged with such effect in a sermon, Saravia asserted in a treatise. This eminent Divine, a German by birth, quitted his native country when the purity of the Christian Ministry was an article of the public confession of faith, and cast himself on the protection of the Church of England<sup>e</sup>. Before his departure from Germany he had rendered an essential service to Episcopacy by his answer to Beza; and no sooner had he been received into the communion of the English Church, than he proved his title to its privileges. Thoroughly conversant in ecclesiastical antiquity, he displayed his superiority in this branch of theological learning, by a treatise on the different Orders of the Christian Ministry<sup>f</sup>, and incontrovertibly proved, that Bishops were not only of a superior degree, but of a different order, from Priests.

Saravia, in the age of Elizabeth, was cherished by the Church of England for his own sake; by posterity his memory will be venerated chiefly because he was the chosen friend of one whose writings have survived the lapse of time, accompanied by changes in opinion and in language. Of Saravia it is enough to say, that he was the friend of HOOKER.

If Hooker had not lived, it would have been incumbent on an historian of the English Church to have set forward the arguments of the other adversaries of Puritanism in full display and dilatation: but the energy of Whitgift, the eloquence of Bancroft, and the mildness of Saravia, are combined in that immortal work, THE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

That this work is still considered as the standard to

<sup>e</sup> He was Prebendary of Canterbury. See Walton's Life of Hooker.

<sup>f</sup> Entitled "De Diversis Ministrorum Evangelii Gradibus, sicut a Domino fuerunt instituti et traditi ab Apostolis \*."—Authore Hadriani Saravia: Belga. Lond. 1590.

\* There is a translation of this Treatise by Professor Street. Oxf. 1840.

which the Church of England may confidently appeal, as exhibiting the true, settled, and catholic principles of the English Reformation, is an unanswerable proof of its excellence. It derives no adventitious weight from the character or circumstances of its author, nor from its accommodation to the prejudices of a particular age. Never was any work less indicative of its author's character: Hooker was of a temper artless, retiring, and contemplative, remarkable for his ignorance of the world, and his unsuspecting simplicity: but the Ecclesiastical Polity is the performance of a man who had attentively studied, and therefore could accurately develop, the motives of human actions; it is the performance of a keen and penetrating observer of popular opinions and of passing events; and the style possesses the graphic distinctness of one who has mingled in the business of life. His description of the Puritans is one of the most vivid and masterly portraits which was ever drawn by a human pen<sup>s</sup>.

Yet Hooker, throughout the largest portion of his life, lived either in the seclusion of a college, or in the obscurity of a country parish. The only preferment which brought him into active life was the Mastership of the Temple; and this station opposition and intrigue, joined with his love of retirement and hatred of contention, soon induced him to quit.

If the writings of Hooker derive no weight from his character, they derive no popularity from his accommodation to prevailing opinion. The times in which he lived were adverse to the reception of those principles on which his Ecclesiastical Polity is founded. Both Papists and Puritans, however opposed on other points, agreed in this, that the civil power was subordinate to the ecclesiastical. Both parties maintained that civil government was derived from the will of the people; and the doctrine was taught for the purpose of justifying resistance. By the Papists,

<sup>s</sup> Eccl. Pol. Pref. Keble's Ed. p. 216.

civil government was considered as nothing more than an emanation from the spiritual power; and, according to their tenets, the power of the keys ought to control that of the sword. The Civil Magistrate was bound to execute the decrees of the Pope, the Vicegerent of Christ, and, in case of disobedience, might be deposed. The Popes had acted in conformity to this doctrine with regard to England: the reigning Pontiff had threatened to depose Edward the Sixth, and had actually deposed Elizabeth. An exertion of spiritual authority so unpopular, the Jesuits had endeavoured to render acceptable by the inculcation of a popular dogma, that all civil government is derived from the people.

The Puritans entertained the same notions concerning the subjection of Kings and Civil Magistrates to the holy discipline of the Church. Calvin had asserted the power of the keys as strongly as the See of Rome, and maintained that, "to a Minister with his eldership power is given by the law of God to excommunicate even Kings and Princes themselves." The most devoted adherents of the See of Rome held that Kings were bound to execute its Bulls, as far as they could; and the Puritans as strongly insisted, that a Church constituted on a Presbyterian basis, had the sole power of defining matters of faith, and of distinguishing between necessary and unnecessary points of doctrine, and also that the Civil Magistrate was obliged to enforce the decisions of the Church. They did not rest here, for they maintained that he was bound to suppress all sects and heresies, and all opinions contrary to sound doctrine. The Civil Magistrate who failed in the performance of this sacred duty ceased to be a child of God, and might be deprived of that dominion which was founded on grace. That the sceptre might be transferred from the reprobate to the elect was their favourite maxim, and the Calvinists in Holland carried it into practice, when, upon some remissness in the states to suppress heretical opinions,

they sent a deputation of their clergy, offering to Elizabeth the sovereignty of six of the Belgic provinces.

To combat these dangerous opinions, to preserve the person of the Sovereign inviolate, and the kingdom from anarchy, to raise the superstructure of civil government on a foundation more secure than the uncertain will of the multitude, many of the Episcopalian Divines went into a contrary extreme. They laid the foundation of all human sovereignty in divine right, and hence inferred that, as the Civil Magistrate was amenable to no court of human judicature, he was accountable to God alone. Resistance to the unlawful commands of a lawful governor was a crime, and rebellion was worse than idolatry, and it was not more justifiable on account of an infringement of the laws, than on account of the personal vices of the Sovereign.

Hooker coincided with neither of these parties, but, "superior to every thing, followed the truth<sup>b</sup>." The design of his Ecclesiastical Polity, as stated by himself, was to settle the existing controversies on religion and government, and to "follow the light of sound and sincere judgment, without either cloud of prejudice or mist of passionate affection<sup>i</sup>." In his Introduction, he first considered what law is in general, and then distinguished its several kinds, and the obligations which each kind imposes. Having laid this foundation, he proceeded to undermine "the main pillar" of the Puritanical fabric, that Scripture ought to be the only rule of human actions. The other and weaker stay of their fabric was, that since God is both Teacher and Governor of His Church, there must of necessity be found in Scripture "some particular form of ecclesiastical polity, the laws whereof admit not any kind of alteration." The first three books being devoted to the consideration of these fundamental points, the fourth

<sup>b</sup> Bp. Warburton's Letters, p. 200.

<sup>i</sup> Pref. to Eccles. Polity, p. 169. Oxon. 1820.

proceeded, “from the general grounds and foundations of the puritanical discipline,” to answer the general accusations of the Puritans against the Church of England. Their general allegation was, that the apostolical form of Church polity was corrupted by manifold Popish rites and ceremonies, and that the foreign reformed Churches had given an example which England ought to follow. From this general accusation a transition was made to particular charges, and these were discussed in the four remaining books. The fifth book contained an examination of the objections against the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments. The sixth and seventh books relate to “the power of jurisdiction,” and two questions are therein discussed: the one, whether laymen, such as governing elders, ought to be invariably vested with this power? the other, whether Bishops may have that power over other Pastors, and that accession of temporal dignity, which they possess in the English Church? “And because, besides the power of order which all consecrated persons have, and the power of jurisdiction which neither they all nor they only have, there is a third power, a power of ecclesiastical dominion,” which is communicable to persons not ecclesiastical, and which ought to be restrained to the Sovereign of the whole body politic: the eighth and last book was allotted to this question, and the objections against the regal supremacy in ecclesiastical causes fully answered. A Church and a Commonwealth are things in nature distinguished from each other; but in the opinion of some, a Church and a Commonwealth are not only distinguished in nature and definition, but perpetually severed in substance, so that they who belong to the one can neither themselves execute, nor appoint persons to execute, the duties of the other. The causes of this popular but dangerous error are rightly assigned: the one, because the professors of the true religion, living under a government professing

a false religion, are constrained to form a religious society separate from the body politic; the other, because things appertaining to religion are always administered by an order of men distinguished from other orders; whence arises a fallacious notion of a total separation of the Church from the Commonwealth.

In treating of the origin of civil government, Hooker has avoided the errors both of the Papists and the Puritans, without falling into those of many Divines of the English Church. When God created man, his Creator endued him with power to guide himself into what kind of society he might choose to live. Society is necessary to the preservation of mankind, and government is essential to society. Government in general is the appointment of God, and in this respect it is a divine ordinance; but to man is left the power of framing and modifying government, and in this respect it is a human ordinance. Where kingly power is established, all Kings have not equal authority: there are Kings who reign by conquest, and therefore make their own charter; there are Kings who reign by the special appointment of God, and therefore enjoy that degree of authority which God has assigned; and there are Kings who reign by composition or agreement, and their authority is limited by the articles of compact between them and their subjects. Articles of compact are defined to be not merely those which have been at first solemnly ratified, and which have been effaced from the memory; but those which have received a voluntary assent, of which positive laws are the evidence, or a tacit allowance of which, immemorial prescription is the proof.

That the Civil Magistrate is invested with authority over all classes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, Hooker maintains against the objections of Calvin. The reformer of Geneva had condemned the title assumed by Henry the Eighth, of "Head of the Church under Christ." Hooker vindicates

this title from the charge of blasphemy, and shews that the title of "Head" is used to denote any kind of superiority or preeminence, and that the headship given to the King over the ecclesiastical state widely differs from that claimed by Jesus Christ over His Church. The headship given to Kings "is altogether visibly exercised, and ordereth only the external frame of Church affairs;" the headship ascribed to Christ is supreme, absolute, and spiritual; so that it differs from the headship of earthly Kings in order, in degree, and in essence.

It was a popular opinion among the sectarists of those days, that even if the ecclesiastical supremacy be conceded to the Civil Magistrate, yet the power of ecclesiastical legislation ought to be vested in a King and a temporal Parliament. The Sovereign not having this power in himself, cannot communicate it to his Parliament; for the power resides in the spiritual Pastors of the Christian Church. Here an opportunity presented itself for a clear explanation of Hooker's principles of Church government. "The Parliament of England," he observes, "*together with the Convocation annexed thereto*, is that whereupon the very essence of all government within this kingdom doth depend; it is even the very body of the whole realm, and consisteth of the King and of all that within the realm are subject to him. The Parliament is a court not so merely temporal as if it might meddle with nothing but leather or wool. Those days of Queen Mary are not forgotten wherein the realm did submit itself to the Legate of Pope Julius, at which time had it been thought that there is no more force in laws made by Parliament concerning Church affairs, than if men should take upon them to make ordinances for the hierarchies of angels in heaven, the former Statutes concerning religion might have been taken to be abrogated without any repeal." "Had they," he asks, "power to repeal laws already made, and none to make laws for the government of

the Church? It is allowed, that, in spiritual matters, in framing a Liturgy, in drawing up Articles of Faith, in prescribing Ceremonies, Bishops and spiritual Pastors are far more competent than men of secular occupations. But when their wisdom has done its best, it is the general consent of all classes, both temporal and spiritual, which gives to their labours the form and vigour of laws, without which they would be nothing more than wholesome admonitions and instructions." "Wherefore," he concludes, "to determine ecclesiastical matters by way of assent and approbation is within the province and competence of Parliament."

The preceding detail is intended not as an analysis of Hooker's work, but as a specimen of his reasoning. That his Ecclesiastical Polity has answered the end which its author proposed, few will be disposed to deny: he has razed the unsightly structure of the Calvinistic discipline, and dissipated its fragile materials. His doctrinal tenets, as they were in his own time the subject of exception and cavil, so they have been since received with qualified approbation, even when they have not been met with dissent. On his first public appearance as a preacher, he delivered a doctrine contrary to the great oracle of the foreign Church, Calvin: that in God there were two wills, an antecedent and a consequent will. The first, or antecedent will of God was, that all mankind should be saved; but His second will was, that those only should be saved whose lives were answerable to that degree of grace which He had offered or afforded to them.

This notion, for which Hooker incurred the censure of Travers, he defended in a separate treatise; and he has also maintained the same distinction in his Ecclesiastical Polity. Such a belief he held to be the only foundation of prayer in behalf of all conditions of men. "Our prayers for all men do include both them that shall find mercy, and them also that shall find none. For them that shall,

no man will doubt but our prayers are both accepted and granted. Touching them for whom we crave that mercy which is not to be obtained, let us not think that our Saviour did misinstruct His disciples, willing them to pray for the peace even of such as should be uncapable of so great a blessing....And if any man should doubt how God should accept such prayers, in case they be opposite to His will, or not grant them if they be according to that which Himself willeth, our answer is, that such suits God accepteth, in that they are conformable to His *general inclination*, which is, that all mankind might be saved; yet always He granteth them not, forasmuch as there is in God sometimes a more private *occasional will*, which determineth the contrary. So that the other being the rule of our actions, and not this, our requests for things opposite to this will of God are not therefore the less gracious in His sight<sup>k</sup>."

If this doctrine of Hooker excited against him a formidable opposition, he had the courage and the charity to maintain another doctrine, still more unpalatable than that the will of God was, that all mankind should be saved. In one of his sermons, he was bold enough to say, that he doubted not that God was merciful to many of our forefathers living in Popish superstition, forasmuch as they sinned ignorantly; in other words, he admitted the possibility that Papists might obtain salvation. This charitable, this Christian supposition, startled Whitgift, and was not assented to by the Primate without qualifying its terms. But it was encountered by the unqualified denial of Travers, who argued that it was impossible for Papists to be saved, because they sought to be justified by the merit of their works, and so overthrew the foundation of faith. Hooker, when he defended his position, was careful to obviate any misconstruction of his words, and fully admitted the great Protestant doc-

<sup>k</sup> Eccles. Polity, Keble's Ed. b. v. §. lxix. p. 275.

trine, that man is justified by the merits of Christ. "There is no meritorious cause of our salvation but Christ, no effectual but His mercy. We deny the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; we imbase, disannul, and annihilate the benefit of His bitter Passion, if we rest in those proud imaginations that life everlasting is deservedly ours, that we merit it, and that we are worthy of it. This belief is to destroy the very essence of our justification. Howbeit considering how many virtuous and just men, how many saints, how many martyrs, how many of the ancient Fathers of the Church have had their sundry perilous opinions; and amongst sundry of their opinions this, that they hoped to make God some part of amends for their sins by the voluntary punishments which they laid upon themselves; shall we therefore make such deadly epitaphs and set them upon their graves, 'They denied the foundation of faith directly, they are damned, there is no salvation for them'?"... "Surely," he adds, "I must confess unto you, that if it be an error to think that God may be merciful to save men when they err, my greatest comfort is my error: were it not for the love that I bear unto this error, I could neither wish to speak or live!"

When Hooker and Travers were associated at the Temple, it was said, that "the morning sermon spake Canterbury, and the afternoon Geneva<sup>m</sup>." This must be understood of Hooker's agreement in discipline with the English Church, and that in discipline the English and Genevan Churches were diametrically opposite. How far Hooker agreed with Canterbury, or how far Canterbury and Geneva were opposed in doctrine, will be the subject of a future investigation. The present disquisition will close with a general character of the writings of the illustrious Divine, whose life is so intimately connected with the history of the national Church.

<sup>1</sup> Disc. on Justification, Hooker, Works, Keble's Ed. vol. iii. p. 672.

<sup>m</sup> Isaac Walton's Life of Hooker, Words. Eccl. Biog. vol. iv. p. 246.

It is not the erudition of Hooker, for in erudition he has been surpassed; it is that comprehensive intellect, which was not warped or fettered by prejudice; it is the intense piety by which that powerful intellect was chastened and refined, which has given perpetuity to his writings. His Ecclesiastical Polity was suggested by the theological controversies of his own times; but it is still read when those controversies are forgotten, and its perusal is not confined to mere theologians. Though all his writings are controversial, yet they have the point of controversy without its venom. The vein of animated piety, which insinuates itself into the body of his argument, has not transmuted his materials, but has conferred on them consistence and durability. Calumny, whether directed against his person, or his opinions, could never provoke his Christian meekness into anger, and still less into recrimination. The spirit which dictated the following sentence, in reply to one of his opponents, was ever present: "Your next argument consists of railing and reasons: to your railing I say nothing, to your reasons I say what follows."

Whatever treatment Hooker might have experienced from the malice and the envy of his contemporaries, yet his posthumous fame was not slow, though imperceptible, in its progress. Though no writer combated the Romanists with greater success, yet, to their honour, they have liberally celebrated his praise. The encomium of a Roman Pontiff<sup>n</sup> might have been inscribed on his tomb: "There is no learning that this man hath not searched into, nothing too hard for his understanding: this man indeed deserves the name of an author; his books will get reverence by age, for there is in them such seeds of eternity, that they shall remain till the last fire shall consume all learning."

From the subject matter of the Ecclesiastical Polity, a

<sup>n</sup> Clement VIII. *Ibid.* p. 266.

transition is naturally made to its style. Camden, in praising the modesty and the other eminent qualities of Hooker, has expressed a wish that, for the honour of this kingdom, and the advantage of other nations, his work had been composed in the Latin language, on account of its universality. The English scholar and the English divine will prefer its present garb, because it has conferred immortality on their native tongue. The Ecclesiastical Polity, independently of its subject, and considered merely as a composition, is, beyond comparison, the greatest work of the Elizabethan age. It is not from any predilection for the opinions of Hooker that his style will be preferred, not to his contemporaries, but to one who lived more than a generation after him,—to Milton. The style of Hooker, when compared with that of Milton, possesses equal harmony, more dignity, and, which is strange to say, more courtliness. Hooker, though he had not enjoyed, like Milton, the advantages of foreign travel, was well acquainted with “seemly arts and affairs;” he had a taste for painting, he had an exquisite sense of music, and in the rhythm of his periods may be detected the latent seeds of poetry.

It is impossible to conclude these reflections without expressing the gratifying thought, that a work, whose existence must be coeval with the national language, is consecrated to the defence of THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

## CHAPTER XX.

Progress of doctrinal Calvinism.—Disputes at Cambridge.—Pre-destinarian Controversy.—Lambeth Articles.—Schism between the Jesuits and Seculars.—Death of Elizabeth.—Accession of James.—State of the Scottish Church.—Whitgift sends Nevil into Scotland.—Millenary Petition.—Hampton Court Conference.

THAT the earliest Reformers of the English Church, however they might differ in their notions of discipline,

were of the same mind in points of doctrine, is a proposition which, however confidently assumed, cannot be admitted without limitations. The proposition is true, if understood to imply that there were certain doctrines which the English Reformers were unanimous in maintaining against the Church of Rome; yet a difficulty will still remain, in ascertaining what these doctrines really were. It has been already shewn, that the essential points of difference between the two Churches were reduced to these two: the Papal supremacy and the corporal presence. Other points there were, concerning which the Christian Church has been divided from the apostolic age, on which the Romanists and Reformers disagreed among themselves: but this difference of opinion was no obstacle to Church communion, either with the Romish or Reformed Churches.

Among those points in which a latitude of opinion was allowed by the Church of Rome, must be reckoned those abstruse and inexplicable questions,

Of Providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,  
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,

*Par. Lost*, ii. 560.

questions on which speculation too frequently ends in distraction and scepticism; and discussion, instead of inspiring humility and moderation, leads to impious presumption and interminable discord.

Such questions, at the time of the Reformation, were not authoritatively decided by a Church fond of deciding, and arrogating to its decisions the claim of infallibility. The real opinions of Augustin, Bishop of Hippo, the successful antagonist of Pelagius on predestination and grace, have been as variously represented as the questions themselves have been fiercely agitated; for opposite sects have claimed him as their own. But it is certain, that Augustin was generally esteemed the oracle of the Latin Church, as Cassian was the oracle of the Greek Church.

Of the two great rival orders, the Dominicans denied free will, in which they were followed by the Augustinians, and, with a few exceptions, by the Benedictines. A large majority of the monastic orders, including, at their first institution, the Jesuits, adhered to the doctrine of Augustin; and Bellarmine himself was formed in the Augustinian school. The Council of Trent, therefore, in framing its decrees on these intricate questions, had shewn a neutrality which pleased all and offended none<sup>o</sup>.

Among the earliest Reformers there was a similar diversity of opinion, and a similar latitude was allowed. Luther was originally an Augustinian friar, and as he had embraced the opinions of his master before he separated from the Church of Rome, it can only be said, that he did not abandon them when he began the Reformation. Unguarded and dangerous is the admission, that Luther espoused the opinions of Augustin, as most opposite to the corruptions of the Church of Rome; because these opinions have been espoused by the most zealous Romanists. The Romish doctrines, of merit and works of supererogation, can be combated without embracing predestination; as the Popish doctrines, of purgatory, masses for the dead, and indulgences, may be overthrown without embracing materialism.

Zuinglius, in opposition to Luther, asserted free will; and so far was he from adopting the doctrine of a divine decree, absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional, by which the future condition of each individual was determined, that he went into the contrary extreme: he taught that the kingdom of heaven was attainable by all who lived according to the dictates of right reason<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> Heylin's Quinquarticular Hist. c. iv.....“ yet it is easy to be seen, that they incline more favourably to the Franciscans, whose cause the Jesuits have since wedded, and speak more literally and grammatically to the sense of that party than they do to the others.”....

<sup>p</sup> See Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. cent. xvi. sect. 3. part 2. note, and the authors quoted in proof of this assertion.

When Calvin returned to Geneva, and the Helvetian Church was committed to his government, he entirely reformed its doctrine. It was an essential article of his system, that God, in predestinating from all eternity one part of mankind to everlasting happiness, and another to endless misery, was led to make this distinction by no other motive than His good pleasure and free will. This capital tenet of the Calvinistic scheme was not only defended by its author with great strength of argument, but was made by him an essential requisite of communion with the Genevan Church. Those whom he could not convince, he could excommunicate; and the examples of Castalio and Bolsec may be cited, to prove that the doctrine of absolute predestination could not be opposed at Geneva with impunity<sup>q</sup>.

So great was the reputation of Calvin, that, although he was not the original assertor of the predestinarian tenets, yet the name of DOCTRINAL CALVINISTS was assumed by those who, dissenting from the Calvinistic discipline, embraced the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute and irrespective decrees. The appellation was given inaccurately to such as received Calvin's doctrine in a moderated sense; it was indiscriminately bestowed on the Sublapsarians and the Supralapsarians, though Calvin himself adopted the Supralapsarian hypothesis.

Doctrinal Calvinism was esteemed the standard of orthodoxy in most of the foreign theological seminaries of the reformed Churches. But as the doctrines of the Genevese reformer had not been incorporated into the Protestant Confessions of faith<sup>r</sup>, there were not wanted eminent men by whom they were entirely rejected.

<sup>q</sup> For an account of Castalio and Bolsec, the reader is referred to Bayle's Dictionary.

<sup>r</sup> None of the foreign Protestant Churches assert in their Confessions the absolute decree of reprobation. The Helvetian Confession goes so far as to assert irrespective election, sect. x. p. 34. Oxon. 1827.

Among these opponents was an individual who had himself received his education in the University of Geneva, and had consequently imbibed the doctrinal tenets of Calvin.

Arminius had arrived at the age of maturity before he was induced to enter into an examination of the religious opinions in which he had been educated; but when a careful examination had convinced him of their erroneousness, he promptly and publicly announced his conversion. His high merit had been rewarded by a Theological Professorship in the University of Leyden; and, as his dogmata must have great weight in forming the opinions of his pupils, he thought it incumbent, from motives of honour and conscience, to declare his dissent from the Calvinistic tenets. Two other considerations impelled him to an open declaration of his sentiments: first, he was persuaded that many individuals in the University besides himself revolted from the doctrine of absolute decrees; secondly, he knew that the Belgic Confession, to which he had subscribed, had left this point undecided. Thus animated and encouraged, he taught with equal freedom and success: but as Calvinism was at this time widely spread throughout Holland, his boldness excited a multitude of enemies. He experienced the most severe marks of disapprobation and resentment from those who adhered to the theological system of Geneva, and especially from Gomarus, his colleague in the University of Leyden. Arminius lived to see only the beginning of that controversy, which involved the reformed Churches in dissension.

England soon participated in these unhappy divisions; and the predestinarian controversy, which had been agitated at the beginning of the Reformation, which had continued throughout the reigns of Edward and Mary, was renewed at the conclusion of the reign of Elizabeth. Hitherto the controversy between the Church and the Puritans had

been chiefly about habits and ceremonies, but now it began to open upon points of doctrine, and the Church was not so much opposed to the Puritans as divided against itself. A large proportion of the exiled divines had embraced the Calvinistic doctrines, and on their return, at the Accession of Elizabeth, fearlessly avowed, that, by giving up the discipline, they did not intend to depart from the doctrine taught at Geneva. That there was no necessary connexion between them had been proved by some of the Swiss Cantons, who were Calvinistic in doctrine while they were Zuinglian in discipline. In England this fact now received additional confirmation; for although all the Puritans were Calvinists, both in doctrine and in discipline, yet many doctrinal Calvinists were sincerely attached to Episcopacy, and filled with honour and advantage the highest stations in the English Church.

It is admitted by all parties, that, throughout the former part of Elizabeth's reign, the influence of the Calvinistic doctrines, in the English Church, was decidedly preponderant. The Institutes of Calvin were adopted by the Universities as a manual of theological instruction, and the honour of Calvin's name gave reputation even to his errors; yet this preponderance by no means amounted to unanimity; and, long before the appearance of Arminius, there were divines of eminence who thought that a dissent from the Calvinistic scheme was no dereliction of Protestantism, nor a departure from the doctrines of the Articles of the Church of England.

Baroe, the Margaret Professor of the University of Cambridge, declared strongly against the doctrine of absolute predestination. In a Prelection on the warning of the Prophet Jonah to the Ninevites, illustrating it by parallel cases in the sacred history, he scrupled not to affirm, that it is the will of God that all mankind should have eternal life, if they believe and persevere in the faith

of Christ; but if they do not believe, or fall short in their perseverance, then it is not the will of God that they should be saved<sup>s</sup>.

Harsnett<sup>t</sup>, ten years afterwards, at the time when 1584 he was Chaplain to Whitgift, in a sermon at Saint Paul's Cross, inveighed with great warmth against the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation, popular and predominant as the doctrine at that time was. "The opinion," he observed, "is grown high and monstrous, and men shake and tremble under it;" but he feared not to attack it. He grounded his arguments against the doctrine, on its opposition to the general tenor of Scripture, on its making God the author of sin, on its taking from man all freedom of will, and on its inconsistency with the divine attributes.

When the Arminian scheme was developed in England, it was soon discovered that the strength of the Calvinists resided in the University of Cambridge. Among all the antagonists of Arminius, none was esteemed by the foreign Professor himself to be more worthy of consideration than Perkins. This divine was educated in Christ's College, where he possessed a Fellowship. With respect to his opinions on church government, he was an open favourer of the Puritanical discipline, and, on account of his non-conformity, was summoned more than once before the Court of High Commission; but his peaceable demeanour, his acknowledged learning, and perhaps his high Calvinistic doctrines, procured for him a dispensation from the severities exercised towards many of his nonconforming brethren. In his *Armill*, or *Golden Chain*, the most popular of his numerous works<sup>u</sup>, he has set forth the Supralapsarian

<sup>s</sup> P. Baron, *Praelect.* 29. p. 126. Lond. 1579.

<sup>t</sup> "He was a man of the greatest parts and learning of his time."—Bishop Warburton.

<sup>u</sup> His works are in three volumes folio. His *Armill* has been published in various forms, and translated into various languages.

hypothesis without disguise or palliation, careless of the disgust or offence which he might give to the enemies or the moderate friends of the Calvinistic scheme. But Perkins has rendered a service to Calvinism which must not be omitted. While every pen was drawn in maintaining speculative systems of doctrine, few were employed in promoting vital Christianity. Calvin, in the last chapter of his Institutes, gave a portraiture of the life and manners of a Christian, but not with the copiousness which the subject required. Perkins filled up the outline which Calvin left unfinished, reduced practical Calvinism into method, and shewed its natural effects on Christian morality.

An advocate of doctrinal Calvinism in the University of Cambridge, not more able, but higher in station, than Perkins, was Whitaker. He had signalized himself in a polemical warfare with the most learned Jesuits of his time; he had encountered "the acuteness of Stapleton and the eloquence of Campion," and had entered the lists with that arch-Jesuit Bellarmine. But, though a doctrinal Calvinist, Whitaker was an Episcopalian; and thus, while Perkins was only tolerated in his Fellowship of Christ's College, Whitaker was Master of Saint John's College, and held the influential station of Regius Professor in Divinity.

In opposition to the acknowledged sentiments of the Governors of the University, there were some 1595 individuals sufficiently venturous to proclaim their dissent from the doctrines of Calvin. Barret, a Fellow of Caius College, in a Latin sermon delivered before the University, declared his hostility to the Calvinistic doctrines of election and grace, reflecting with great acrimony on the personal character of Calvin, and cautioning his Orton, a dissenting Minister, well known for his many useful publications, was a maternal descendant of Perkins. Job Orton's Letters to a Young Clergyman, p. 40. Shrewsbury, 1791.

hearers against reading the works of the Genevese Reformer. For this sermon Barret was summoned before the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Colleges, and was commanded to make a retractation of his sermon in the church where he delivered it. He complied, but read his retractation in a manner which shewed its insincerity, and it was considered as an aggravation of his first offence. So unpopular were both the sermon and the retractation, that several Graduates, of different Colleges, signed a petition to the Archbishop, praying that the matter might not be suffered to rest, but that the memory of Calvin, and other great names who had been aspersed, might receive some reparation. Barret, not discouraged, joined in the appeal; and Whitgift, at the first hearing of the dispute, condemned the University for its precipitate censure; but the Heads of the Colleges vindicated their conduct, and insisted on the privileges of the University. The academical delinquent was summoned to appear at Lambeth before the Archbishop and some other divines, and having submitted himself to their examination, his judges decided that some of his opinions were erroneous. They enjoined him to confess his ignorance and mistake with due contrition; but the temper of Barret revolted at the prescribed humiliation, and he prepared to quit the University\*.

The controversy which was at this time commenced by Barret was not terminated by his condemnation and departure. The same opinions which Baroe had maintained in his Prelections, he published in a sermon before the University. In this discourse he asserted 'that God created all men according to His own likeness in Adam, and consequently to eternal life, from which no man was rejected but on account of his sins; that Christ died for all mankind, was a propitiation for the sins of the whole

\* Strype's Life of Whitgift, b. iv. c. xiv. and xv.

world, original and actual ; the remedy provided being as extensive as the evil ; that the promises of eternal life, made to us in Christ, are to be generally and universally taken and understood, being made as much to Judas as to Peter.'

For maintaining these propositions, Baroe was summoned before the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Colleges, who examined him by interrogatories, and having heard his answers, peremptorily commanded him to abstain from publishing such opinions, either in his sermons or lectures. Apprehensive that their censure of Baroe might be thought harsh, they communicated their proceedings to their Chancellor Burghley, and justified their condemnation of Baroe's tenets by representing him as inclined to Popery. His opinions were contrary to those which had prevailed in the University since the accession of the Queen ; and they expressed a fear, that if such novelties were not suppressed, the whole body of Popery might be forced upon them : they therefore earnestly besought their Chancellor to join them in opposing such doctrines.

On the other hand, Baroe wrote, not to the Chancellor of the University, but to the Archbishop ; and, without entering into a defence of his opinions, gave a promise not to publish them in future, and to join in preserving the peace of the University by dropping the controversy in silence<sup>y</sup>. He next addressed Burghley, praying him to stay any further proceedings of the Vice-Chancellor, and, in acceding to this petition, Burghley concurred with Whitgift. On the merits of the question, and on the conduct of the University towards Baroe, these eminent men were divided. Whitgift coincided with the University, and Burghley inclined to Baroe. The Chancellor, in his letter to the University, expressed his indignation at the conduct of that body over which he presided, and

<sup>y</sup> Strype's Life of Whitgift, b. iv. c. xvii. xviii.

scrupled not to ascribe the late persecution of Baroe to envy or hatred<sup>z</sup>.

In order to terminate the dispute with honour to themselves, the Heads of the University, declining any farther appeal to their Chancellor, deputed two of their body, Whitaker and Tyndal, to repair to Lambeth. The object of their mission was, to consult with the Archbishop, assisted by some other Prelates and Divines, on the formation of certain Articles on the controverted points; and to propose that a conformity to these Articles might be required, in order to secure the peace of the University.

Whitgift having associated with himself the Bishop of London<sup>a</sup>, the Bishop elect of Bangor, and some others, a consultation took place with the Divines at Cambridge; and the result of their deliberations was an agreement on the following propositions, afterwards known under the title of the LAMBETH ARTICLES. [Nov. 20, 1595.]

1. God from all eternity has predestinated some persons to life, and others to death.
2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not foreseen faith, or perseverance in good works, or any other quality, in the persons predestinated, but the sole will and pleasure of God.
3. The number of the predestinated is predetermined and certain, and cannot be increased or lessened.
4. Those who are not predestinated to salvation are necessarily condemned on account of their sins.
5. A true, lively, and justifying faith, and the sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, is not extinguished, neither does it fail, nor does it vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally.
6. A man who is truly faithful, or endowed with

<sup>z</sup> “Ye sift him with interrogatories, as if he were a thief, &c... This seems done of stomach among you, &c.” Strype’s Life of Whitgift, b. iv. c. xviii. p. 303.

<sup>a</sup> Fletcher. Fuller, in his Church History, has made Bancroft Bishop of London at this time, in which error he is followed by Wilkins in his Concilia. The mistake of Fuller was noticed and corrected by Heylin.

justifying faith, has a certain and full assurance of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ. 7. Saving grace is not afforded to all men, neither have all men such a communication of the Divine assistance, that they may be saved if they will. 8. No man can come to Christ unless it be granted to him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to Christ. 9. It is not in the will and power of every man to be saved<sup>b</sup>.

Before these propositions were agreed on at Lambeth, they were transmitted by Whitgift to Hutton, Archbishop of York, soliciting his opinion on them, and acquainting him with the animosities prevailing at Cambridge. Hutton, in his reply, while he lamented that dissensions on such points should ever have been raised, appeared to impute the blame to the anti-Calvinists. It was his original intention to have offered his sentiments at length on each of the Articles; but fearing that he might exasperate some persons for whom he entertained a sincere respect and affection, he was contented to deliver his opinion briefly on the points of election and reprobation. He reminded Whitgift that, while they were both at the University of Cambridge, there was no disagreement between them in religious matters<sup>c</sup>.

It is probable that, as soon as these Articles were settled, they were communicated to Burghley, before they were submitted to the Queen. Whitaker thought it an indispensable duty to ask a personal conference with the Chancellor of Cambridge, at which he presented a copy of the Articles, together with a sermon preached by himself. Though oppressed by bodily infirmity, Burghley retained his vigour of mind and soundness of judgment, and did

<sup>b</sup> Fuller's Church History, b. ix. p. 218. and Collier's Ecclesiast. Hist. part ii. b. vii. p. 193.

<sup>c</sup> Fuller's Church History, b. ix. cent. xvi. p. 222. Hutton had been formerly Master of Pembroke Hall, and Regius Professor of Divinity.

not shrink from an argument, even with Whitaker, on a question of theology. With great freedom he signified his disapprobation of the Articles in general, and especially that on predestination. He entered into a long discussion on this point, and to his forcible reasoning Whitaker was either unable or unwilling to offer a reply. These two great men parted, never to meet again; for Whitaker died shortly after his return to Cambridge.

When the Articles were exhibited to the Queen, she expressed her dissatisfaction more strongly even than Burghley. The Calvinists have insinuated that she agreed in their substance; but the advocates of predestination will gain little by enlisting Elizabeth under their banners: her displeasure was unequivocally shewn, because they were framed without her authority, and even without her knowledge, and because such unfathomable mysteries were imposed as Articles of faith. Sir Robert Cecil, one of her secretaries, communicated these sentiments of his Sovereign to Whitgift, and the Archbishop enjoined the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge to use his own discretion with respect to the publication of the Articles, since they were not well received by the Court or by the Queen herself<sup>d</sup>.

It has been doubted whether Whitgift himself really believed in these propositions, or whether he agreed to them, in deference to the judgment of Whitaker, and with a view to subdue the animosities at Cambridge<sup>e</sup>. To rescue a man so deservedly revered by the Church of England as Whitgift, from an imputation which affects his integrity, is the duty of every member of that Church. If Whitgift believed in these Articles, hard of belief as they may appear to some, he believed them in common with many other “burning and shining lights of our Church in her early days, (when first she shook off the Papal tyranny,)”

<sup>d</sup> Strype's Life of Whitgift, b. iv. c. xvii. p. 284.

<sup>e</sup> Heylin's Aerius Redivivus, b. x. p. 345.

long since gone to the resting-place of the spirits of the just<sup>f</sup>;" in common with men, by a comparison with whom even Whitgift might be injured. Viewing him as a high doctrinal Calvinist, the Arminian may apostrophize him : " Such as thou art, would that thou couldst be ours !" But if it can be shewn that he dissembled, both Calvinist and Arminian must reject him with indignation, or receive him with contempt. The Arminian cause needs not such a defender, and it needs not dread Whitgift as an antagonist.

Conscientiously believing in these Articles as Whitgift did, it may still be presumed, that his unbiassed judgment would not have dictated their imposition, either on the Church of England or the University of Cambridge, as Articles of peace. They could have been framed only by a violent partisan of the Supralapsarian hypothesis, and, like all other intemperate measures, injured the cause which they were designed to support. The voluntary and honourable retirement of Baroe from the theatre of contention advanced his character and promoted his opinions, while the inclination of the Queen and her government to Arminianism was unequivocally expressed in the appointment of a successor to Whitaker. Overal was selected to fill the Regius Professorship, whose profound erudition and controversial prowess commanded the admiration of the Arminians and the awe of the Calvinists.

Having related the origin of that controversy which, by dividing the English Church against itself, contributed to its overthrow, it is proper to state, that its ruin was retarded by similar divisions among its enemies. Nothing like union had ever subsisted between the sects of Puritanism; but a schism now took place between the hitherto united Romanists. While Cardinal Allen lived, his prudence had composed the animosities between the Secular Priests and the Jesuits; but after his death their enmity

<sup>f</sup> Bishop Horsley's Charge, 1806.

was undisguised, and almost unrestrained. The Seculars were chiefly natives of England, and professed their allegiance in the most ample terms to Elizabeth, acknowledging the clemency of her government, and their obligations to devote their lives and properties to its maintenance. The writers on their side proved against the Jesuits that, during the first eleven years of this reign, not a single Romanist was capitally prosecuted for his religion; and that, in the next ten years, under the provocation of the Bull of excommunication by Pius the Fifth, and the rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, there were not more than twelve Priests executed, and even some of these were convicted of treasonable practices. It was not till after the first mission of the Jesuits into England that any severities were exercised against members of the Romish religion. To Parsons the Jesuit they attributed the foundation of English seminaries in Spain, to him they also attributed the Spanish invasion of England and Ireland. They argued that religious truth was not to be propagated by rebellion, and they cautioned the English Papists against sending their children to any of the Jesuitical Seminaries.

These professions of loyalty were credited by Bancroft, then Bishop of London; and he afforded his countenance to the Seculars, in spite of Puritanical censure: but this semblance of zeal for a Protestant government was not so readily trusted by Elizabeth and her Council. A Proclamation was published, commanding the Jesuits, and those Secular Priests who joined them, to quit the kingdom, and that, if they presumed to return, they might expect to suffer the extremity of the law<sup>g</sup>.

The close of Elizabeth's reign affords little matter for ecclesiastical history. There was a temporary cessation of hostility between the Church and the Puritans<sup>h</sup>,

<sup>g</sup> Camden's Elizabeth, p. 578.

<sup>h</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. i. c. viii. p. 463.

and both Puritans and Papists were anxiously looking forward to a change of policy by the demise of the Crown. The last days of the Queen were clouded by domestic afflictions, but not by any convulsions in the State, or by any national reverses. Her lofty spirit was subdued, partly by the ingratitude of the Earl of Essex, and partly by seeing herself the object of comparative indifference and neglect. Of all her counsellors, Whitgift alone remained, to cheer the gloom of her declining years. Providence had spared him, to be the chief consolation of her life, as well as the instrument of its preservation ; he was also spared “to be the greatest comfort of her soul upon her death-bed, to be present at the expiration of her last breath, and to behold the closing of those eyes that had long looked upon him with reverence and affection<sup>i</sup>. ”

Among the weaknesses of Elizabeth was that of refusing to appoint her successor; a measure which was incumbent, from every motive of policy and conscience. Arguments of policy had been urged by the House of Commons, arguments addressed to the conscience had been sometimes urged by the spiritual advisers of the Queen. Hutton, Archbishop of York, had the courage to press this delicate point of fixing the succession, in a sermon before Elizabeth, at Whitehall. He even told her, that Nero was hated on no account more than for wishing to have no successor ; and that Augustus lost much of public esteem for appointing a bad one ; and he intimated that the eyes of the nation were turned upon the King of Spain, as the Prince who, from proximity of blood, might reasonably expect to ascend the English throne<sup>k</sup>.

Elizabeth was left to decide between the King of Spain and the King of Scotland, the one a Papist and the other

<sup>i</sup> Isaac Walton's Life of Hooker, Wordsw. Ecc. Biog. vol. iv. p. 238.

<sup>k</sup> Sir John Harington's Brief View of the State of the Church of England, p. 188. Lond. 1653.

a Presbyterian, and both hostile to the English Church ; but the decision was protracted to her dying moments, when the Lord Keeper and the Secretary Cecil waited on her, by direction of the Privy Council. Her last act of interference with the concerns of this world was to signify her pleasure that the King of Scots, her nearest relation, should succeed her<sup>1</sup>.

As the Accession of James is the era of the union between the two kingdoms, it is necessary to state briefly the condition of the Scottish Church at this period. Through the preaching of John Knox, Scotland, while governed by a Sovereign of the Romish communion, had renounced the authority of the See of Rome, and had submitted to the discipline of Geneva. A few years after the return of this celebrated reformer to his native country, the General Assembly of the Scottish Church had approved the Presbyterian form of church government; but the vote of the Assembly was not confirmed by the Scottish Parliament. The Bishops were not formally deprived either of their revenues or their authority, though all ecclesiastical affairs were virtually managed by Provincial Presbyteries and the General Assembly. The Assembly had passed a vote against Diocesan Episcopacy, and had resolved that Bishops were originally only superintendents of a single parish. Having advanced thus far, it was afterwards voted that Prelates should lay down their titles, and be addressed by their proper names, and in the succeeding year the name of a Bishop was voted to be a grievance. Two years afterwards, the General Assembly unanimously declared Diocesan Episcopacy to be unscriptural and unlawful. During his minority, James the Sixth, and the other members of his family, were obliged to subscribe a Confession of faith, with a solemn League and Covenant annexed, by which they engaged to maintain

1566  
1574  
1577  
1580

<sup>1</sup> Camden's Elizabeth, p. 586.

and defend the Protestant doctrine and the Presbyterian discipline.

The Bishops were indeed restored by the Scottish Parliament to a portion of that dignity of which they had been deprived by the General Assembly; for it was there enacted, that to procure the abolition or diminution of the authority of the three estates of the realm was an act of high treason. But when this Statute was proclaimed, the Ministers of religion protested against it, as not having received the sanction of the Kirk.

When James had arrived at full age, he consented to an Act, taking away all the lands once belonging to the Bishops, and annexing them to the Crown; and subsequently all Acts of Parliament whatsoever, in favour of Popery or Episcopacy, were annulled. All Presentations to benefices were directed to their respective Presbyteries, who were invested with full power to give institution or collation. This Act was confirmed by two successive Parliaments, so that when James ascended the throne of England, Presbyterianism was the legal establishment of his Scottish dominions<sup>m</sup>.

The insincerity of James in his attachment to the Presbyterian discipline can be no longer doubtful. His professions of attachment have been carefully recorded, and perhaps magnified by those who were incensed at his change of conduct, and those are the only historians of his earlier years<sup>n</sup>. It has been stated, that, on a particular occasion, standing up in the General Assembly convened at Edinburgh, with uncovered head and uplifted hands, he praised God that he was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place, as to be King of such a Church, the sincerest Kirk in the world. "The Church of Geneva," he said, "keep Pasche and Yule: what have they for them? They have no institution. As for our

<sup>m</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. ii. c. i. p. 2.

<sup>n</sup> Calderwood's Hist. Ch. Scot. p. 88. ed. 1678.

neighbour Kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English ; they want nothing of the mass but its liftings. I charge you, my good Ministers, Doctors, Elders, Noblemen, Gentlemen, and Barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same." In his speech to his Parliament, not long before the death of Elizabeth, he assured the estates that he had no intention to introduce Papistical or Anglican Bishops. And finally, when he left his native country, to take possession of the Crown of England, he gave public thanks to God, in the Kirk of Edinburgh, that he left both Kirk and Kingdom in that state which he never intended to alter while his subjects lived in peace.

The parentage of James being of the Romish faith, and the spontaneous declarations of his mature years being in favour of the Presbyterian discipline, the hopes of the English Puritans and Papists were raised, and those of the friends of Protestant Episcopacy were proportionably depressed. As soon as Elizabeth was dead, Whitgift, unceasingly watchful for the safety of the Church, sent Nevil, the Dean of Canterbury, into Scotland, to give assurances of the unfeigned duty and loyalty of the English Church to its new Sovereign, and to recommend it to his countenance and protection. The King answered briefly but decisively, that he would uphold the government of the Church as the Queen had left it.

In the interval which elapsed between the Accession of James and his arrival in England, amidst their hopes, all parties had their fears, but all were ready to lay before him their grievances and their wishes. The Papists reminded him that he was born of Roman Catholic parents ; that he had been baptized according to the rites of the Church of Rome ; that his mother, of whom he always spoke with reverence, was a martyr for the Roman Catholic faith ; and that he himself, on various occasions, had expressed no dislike to the Romish doctrines, though

he disallowed the usurpations of the Romish See; and, under these circumstances, they welcomed him with assurances of their allegiance, and with a petition for an open toleration.

The Dutch and French Churches, which had enjoyed under Elizabeth their peculiar rites and discipline, addressed James for a continuance of their privileges. The King replied, that many words were unnecessary to assure them of his good will; he respected their confidence in selecting his dominions as a religious sanctuary, and promised that if their assemblies were disturbed, he would avenge their cause as if they were his natural subjects.

While the King was in his progress towards the metropolis of his new kingdom, the Puritans presented their *milleenary petition*, so called because it was said to be subscribed by a thousand hands. Its title was imposing, but it conveyed a fallacy, and its substance was not less false than its title<sup>o</sup>. The subscribers thought it fit to style themselves Ministers of the Church of England, and professed that, "neither as factious men, affecting a popular parity in the Church, nor as schismatics, aiming at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical, but as the faithful Ministers of Christ, and loyal subjects to his Majesty, they humbly desired the redress of some abuses." And although many of them had formerly subscribed their assent to the Liturgy, some upon a protestation, others on an explanation, and others upon conditional terms; yet now "they groaned under the burden of human rites and ceremonies, and with one consent threw themselves down at his royal feet for relief...."

Their grievances were divided under four heads: first, of the Liturgy, containing a repetition of all the Puritanical objections; secondly, of the Articles, from which they solicited a release of subscription; thirdly, of Church

<sup>o</sup> It was subscribed by not more than eight hundred out of twenty-five counties. Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. ii. c. i. p. 4.

property, being a condemnation of pluralities and lay impropriations; and lastly, of Church discipline, being a complaint of the Ecclesiastical Courts. These grievances, they alleged, were not agreeable to the Word of God, and they humbly desired that they might be permitted to prove the truth of their allegation, either in disputation, writing, or conference.

No sooner was this attack made on the privileges and discipline of the Church, than it was repelled by the two Universities. These learned bodies expressed their disapprobation at the conduct of the Millenary subscribers, though in a different manner. The University of Cambridge passed a decree in its Senate, that if any of its members publicly impugned the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, he should be suspended from any Degree which he had already taken, and be disabled from taking any Degree in future. The University of Oxford published an answer to the Millenary Petition, dedicated to the King, with a preface addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Chancellors of both Universities, and the two Secretaries of State. The answer, in terms of just severity, reproached the petitioners with having first subscribed, and with afterwards having solicited a release from their subscription. It commended the Episcopal form of government, as the best support of the Monarchy, and the best for the promotion of theological learning. It averred, that there were more learned men in England than could be found in all the other Protestant Churches of Europe<sup>p</sup>.

The divines of Cambridge transmitted to their brethren of Oxford a letter of thanks for this seasonable vindication of the ecclesiastical establishment, highly commending its weighty arguments, and, in allusion to the boasted numbers of the Puritans, observed, "If Saul has his thousands, David has his ten thousands." They intimated to the

<sup>p</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. iv. no. cclxxvii.

sister University their own decree; and, in reply to that part of the petition which invited a disputation, said, "Let these Puritans answer our almost a thousand books in defence of the hierarchy, before they presume to dispute before so learned and wise a King."

When James had approached London as near as Theobalds, a Royal Palace at Cheshunt, Whitgift requested an audience, and received from the King his assurances of protection of the Church of England. The Archbishop then with alacrity prepared himself to perform the duties of his station at the Coronation, and the august solemnity was celebrated in the Collegiate Church of Westminster.

The Puritans having renewed their importunities, if not for a redress, yet at least for a calm discussion of their grievances, neither the King nor the Prelates were indisposed to grant their request. Whitgift, though advanced in age, and declining in strength, remitted nothing of his characteristic activity. Not a pamphlet nor a petition escaped his vigilance, or escaped without an answer<sup>q</sup>.

To deprive the Puritans of all reasonable cause of complaint, the King agreed to the conference which they had so earnestly solicited, and issued a proclamation for its meeting. As to his own persuasion, he declared that the constitution of the Church of England was agreeable to the Word of God, and the practice of the primitive Church: yet, because he had received information that there were some things in it which gave offence and

<sup>q</sup> In one of his letters to Cecil, afterwards Earl of Shrewsbury, Whitgift observed:....."although our humorous and contentious brethren have made many petitions and motions correspondent to their natures, yet,....to my comfort,...they have not much prevailed. Your Lordship, I am sure, doth imagine that I have not been all this while idle, nor greatly quiet in mind: for who can promise himself rest among so many vipers?"

scandal, he had appointed a meeting of divers Bishops and other learned men, at which he intended to be present. In the mean time, he commanded his subjects to forbear from presenting petitions, for he was determined to preserve the Church in such a form as he had found it established by law, and he would consent only to rectify such abuses as he found to be manifestly proved.

The place appointed for this Conference was the Palace at Hampton-Court, and the disputants on each side were nominated by the King<sup>r</sup>. On the part of the Church were nine Bishops, two alone of whom appear to have taken a prominent part in the debate, and these two were Whitgift and Bancroft. Several inferior dignitaries were joined with the Bishops, among whom are recorded the names of Andrews, Overal, Barlow, and Bridges; divines who had been already known by their writings in defence of the hierarchy, or who, by their subsequent labours in the same cause, justified the propriety of their selection on this occasion. On the part of the Puritans, only four of their Ministers appeared, although more had been summoned, and two came from each University<sup>s</sup>. The divines of the Church wore the habits of their respective orders; but the Puritanical ministers, with their accustomed contempt of established ordinances and external propriety, were habited like Turkey merchants.

The Conference continued during three days, Jan. 14.  
on the first of which the Bishops and other  
divines of the Church alone were present, to- 16. 18.  
gether with a numerous crowd of courtiers, and the Lords

<sup>r</sup> An account of the Conference was published by Barlow, Dean of Chester. It is printed in the first volume of the *Phœnix*. Other accounts have been published by the Puritanical party, particularly by Patrick Galloway, a Scotsman. See Strype's Life of Whitgift, Appendix to b. iv. no. 45, which contains a letter from the Bishop of Durham to the Archbishop of York.

<sup>s</sup> Dr. John Reynolds and Dr. Thomas Sparke, from Oxford; Mr. Chadderton and Mr. Knewstubbs from Cambridge.

of the Privy Council. The King opened the business of the day with a speech in commendation of the English hierarchy, and he congratulated himself that he was now come into the promised land, that he sat among grave and reverend men, and that he was not now, as formerly, a King without state, nor in a place where beardless boys might brave him to the face. He assured the assembly, that he had not convened it from any desire of innovation, for he acknowledged the Ecclesiastical State, as it was already established, to be approved by manifold blessings from God Himself. But since he had received complaints of irregularities and abuses in the Church, he was willing to remove them, if scandalous, and to take them into consideration, even if trivial. The main reason of his holding a separate consultation with the Prelates and Divines of the Church, was to receive satisfaction from themselves on three points: first, on the objections against the Book of Common Prayer; secondly, on the abuses of the Ecclesiastical Courts; and, thirdly, on the religious state of Ireland. If on either of these points there should be any grievances fit to be redressed, it might be done of their own pure suggestion, without being driven to redress abuses by the arguments of their opponents.

The objections against the Common Prayer Book related to the rite of Confirmation, which had been represented to the King to imply a second baptism; but the Archbishop, on his knees, explained, that the Church did not hold Baptism to be incomplete without Confirmation. Bancroft said, that the rite itself was of Apostolical practice, if not of Apostolical institution, and that it was called in Scripture the rite of “laying on of hands.” But, to satisfy the scruples of the Puritans, it was agreed, that to the title of Confirmation should be added the words, “and examination of children.”

The King, in the next place, excepted to the Absolution pronounced in the Daily Service, as having too great a

resemblance to the Church of Rome; but the Archbishop completely vindicated the practice of the English Church from the charge. Bancroft defended not only the Absolution in the Daily Service, but that in the Office of the Communion and Visitation of the Sick; adding, that "similar forms were retained by the Confessions of Augsburg, Bohemia, and Saxony; and that Calvin himself had approved such a General Confession and Absolution as was used by the English Church." The conclusion was, that in a future consultation it should be determined whether the words "remission of sins" should not be added to the Absolution in the Rubric.

Another objection offered by the King was against Private Baptism, and Baptism by women. It had been customary in the Church of Rome, and the custom was not formally abolished, nor entirely discontinued, in England after the Reformation, to license midwives for the performance of the Sacrament of Baptism in cases of necessity. An oath was taken for the due performance of the Sacrament; and the Baptism, when performed, was to be certified to the Curate of the parish. The Archbishop assured the King, that although the practice of lay Baptism had not been abolished formally, yet it was scarcely ever used in the Church of England. Others said, that lay Baptism was a reasonable practice, the Minister not being essential to the Sacrament. But the King not being satisfied, it was referred to consideration, whether the word "Curate," or "lawful Minister," should not be inserted in the Office for Private Baptism.

The King proceeding to the second head of conference, the abuses of the Ecclesiastical Courts, it was agreed, that for light offences the name of excommunication should be changed, though the same censure should be retained, or an equivalent substituted.

These were all the alterations agreed on between the King and the Bishops on the first day of the Conference;

for the religious state of Ireland was not discussed. The result of this day's debate was reported by a Presbyterian Minister, named Patrick Galloway, to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, in a manner very unfavourable to the Bishops. According to his statement, the King commanded them, as they would answer it to God on their consciences, and to himself on their allegiance, to advise among themselves concerning the corruptions of the Church. The Bishops reported that all was well; and when the King, with great earnestness, adduced many defects and abuses, they prayed the King, on their knees, that no alteration might take place. It is not improbable that this Presbyterian Minister might have exhibited the doubts and objections of the King in a different light from that which was intended by James himself. The King might have placed the objections of the Puritans in the strongest point of view, and have clothed them in the most offensive garb, to see whether they could be answered. Andrews, afterward Bishop of Winchester, penetrated into the motive of James; for he said that, on the first day, the King "during five hours did wonderfully play the Puritan."

On the second day of the conference the four Presbyterian Ministers, with Alexander Galloway, a Minister of Perth, were introduced into the royal presence to sustain the cause of the Puritans. On the side of the Church, a selection was made of two Bishops, and about six other divines, the rest being secluded, that the Puritans might not be overpowered by numbers. The King being seated, with his courtiers and Privy Counsellors standing around him, informed the nonconforming Ministers, that he was prepared to hear their objections against the Ecclesiastical Establishment.

Of these Puritan divines, it would be malignant praise to say that Reynolds was the most able, for he was reputed to be the greatest scholar of his age and country. He was one of two brothers who had mutually converted

each other<sup>t</sup>, and in polemical theology was esteemed fully equal to contend with Bellarmine, the Goliath of the Church of Rome. Wonders are related of his extensive reading, and of his vast memory. Such was the man who stood before James, to propound and enforce the scruples of the Puritans.

In the name of his brethren, Reynolds humbly requested, 1. That the doctrines of the Church might be preserved in purity; 2. That good Pastors might be planted in all churches to preach the same; 3. That the Book of Common Prayer might be fitted to more increase of piety; 4. That Church government might be sincerely administered according to God's Word.

1. Whatever objections the Puritans might have hitherto entertained against the discipline and Liturgy of the Church, yet they always admitted its doctrines to be scriptural. That there was no difference in point of doctrine between the Puritans and Conformists is the confession of their own historian. But now, for the first time, they expressed a wish to model the doctrinal Articles. The Episcopalian Calvinists had already shewn their dissatisfaction at the Articles, by their attempt to establish the Lambeth Articles on predestination and absolute decrees; but they had not as yet testified a design of altering the established Confession of Faith. The Puritan Ministers went one step further, for they desired not only that the Lambeth Articles might be added to the Thirty-nine, but that some of these Thirty-nine might be altered.

In the sixteenth Article it is said, that "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may fall from grace." Reynolds very naturally imagined that this passage was

<sup>t</sup> William, the other brother, died in 1594, and published many Tracts in defence of the Romish religion; John, the subject of the present narrative, was President of Corpus Christi College in Oxford, and died in 1607.

adverse to the Calvinistic doctrine of the perseverance of the elect; and therefore requested that the words, “yet neither totally nor finally,” might be added by way of explanation.

Bancroft was ready with an answer, and observed, that “very many in those days, neglecting holiness of life, presumed too much on persisting in grace, laying all their religion on predestination. ‘If I shall be saved, I shall be saved,’ was a desperate doctrine, contrary to sound theology and the true doctrine of predestination. We shall rather arrive at predestination by an ascending than a descending ratio. We should argue thus: ‘I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbour, I follow my vocation, therefore I trust God hath elected me, and predestinated me to salvation.’ Not thus: ‘God hath predestinated me to life; therefore, though I sin never so grievously, I shall not be damned; for whom He loveth, He loveth unto the end.’” Whereupon he shewed the King, out of the seventeenth Article, what was the doctrine of the Church of England concerning predestination in the very last paragraph; namely, “We must receive God’s promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture; and in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God.”

The royal moderator, whatever might be his private opinion on these abstruse points, approved the reference made by Bancroft; he farther refused to admit the Lambeth Articles into a public Confession of faith, or to introduce into any public formulary such theological niceties; because, on such abstruse points, there will always be a difference and a contrariety of opinion.

An exception was also taken by Reynolds to the twenty-third Article, that “it is unlawful for any one to take upon himself the office of preaching or administering the Sacraments in the congregation before he is lawfully called.”

He moved that the words “in the congregation” be omitted, as if they implied a licence to perform these functions out of the congregation without a lawful call. He also objected an inconsistency between the twenty-fifth Article and the Collects of Confirmation, and insinuated that the solemnity might be performed by a priest. But after hearing Bancroft, the King gave his opinion that it ought to be performed by a Bishop, and closed his remarks with his favourite maxim, “No Bishop, no King.”

After some interruption Reynolds proceeded, and desired a new Catechism, that in the Common Prayer-Book being too short, and that of Nowell being too long. To this suggestion the King consented, provided that all curious and abstruse questions might be avoided in teaching the rudimental principles of Christianity, and that our agreement with the Papists in some points might not be esteemed heterodoxy. Reynolds further requested a new translation of the Bible; to which the King agreed, on condition that there were no marginal notes, observing, that of all translations, the Genevan was the worst, since it justified rebellion against Kings.

Reynolds next complained of the publication of seditious books, particularly those written by Papists; a complaint which called forth a reply from Bancroft, against whom it was principally directed. The King also vindicated Bancroft, desiring Reynolds to acquaint his party that the Bishop had been misrepresented and injured, and that his conduct was worthy of commendation. By his management the breach had been widened between the Jesuits and Seculars, to the prejudice of the Romish religion. Cecil added, that these books had rendered an essential service to the English government, that they confuted the pretensions of the King of Spain to the English Crown, and exculpated the late Queen and her Ministers from the imputation of executing Papists purely on account of their

religion. "Doctor," determined the King, "you are a better College man than a Statesman."

2. Having prayed that some remedy might be provided against the profanation of the Lord's day, Reynolds went on to the second head. He complained of pluralities, and prayed that all parishes might be supplied with preaching Ministers. Bancroft petitioned that all parishes might have a praying Ministry, since preaching was so much in fashion that the worship of God was neglected. Pulpit harangues were often dangerous; and therefore he humbly moved that the number of Homilies might be increased, and that the Clergy might be obliged to read them, instead of their own crude or spleenetic compositions. The Puritan Ministers replied, on being required to give an opinion, that a preaching Ministry was most useful, though they allowed that, when preachers could not be obtained, godly prayers, homilies, and exhortations might be productive of good. Some jocularities passed on the subject of pluralities, but the debate was closed by the King, who promised to refer the matter to the Bishops.

3. The objections of the Puritans comprehended under the third head were numerous. Reynolds complained of the late Articles imposed by Whitgift, in consequence of which imposition many Clergymen were deprived, though they were willing to subscribe the doctrinal Articles of the Church, to acknowledge the King's Supremacy, and to obey the Statutes of the realm. He excepted also to the reading the Apocryphal books in the public Service, to the interrogatories and the sign of the Cross in Baptism, to the surplice and the other habits, to the ring in the Service of Marriage, and to the Churcning of Women under the title of purification. Those things, he said, were relics of Popery; they had been abused to purposes of idolatry, and therefore ought to be abolished.

Here the King interposed, and said, that the surplice

was a comely garment, and that the cross was as old as Constantine: it was not more a superstitious sign than the imposition of hands, which the Puritans allowed to be of Apostolic institution. As for the other exceptions, they were capable of a satisfactory explanation. "But," continued the King, "as to the power of the Church in things indifferent, I will not argue that point with you, but answer as the Sovereign answers his Parliament, *Le roi s'avisera*. Your objections are like those of a beardless boy, who told me, at a late conference in Scotland, that he would hold conformity with me in doctrine, but that, as to ceremonies, every man ought to be left at liberty. But I will have none of that: I will have one doctrine, one religion in substance and ceremony: never speak to that point again, how far you are bound to obey."

4. Reynolds was going on to complain of excommunication by lay-Chancellors; but the King having said that he should consult the Bishops on this head, the Puritan divine further desired, that the Clergy might be permitted to hold assemblies at stated periods; that in Rural Deaneries there might be a liberty of holding prophesying; that those cases which could not be resolved there, might be referred to the Archdeacon at his Visitation, and thence to a Diocesan Synod. At this the King could no longer contain his indignation, but told the Puritan Ministers that he now saw through their intentions; they were aiming at a Scottish Presbytery, which agreed as well with Monarchy as God and the devil. He continued in a strain of coarse invective, and then turning to the Bishops, he said, "My Lords, I may thank you that the Puritans plead for my supremacy; for if once you were out, and they were in place, I know what would become of my supremacy; for, no Bishop, no King." Having asked Reynolds if he had any thing more to offer, and being answered in the negative, he terminated the debate in the following manner: "If this be all your party hath

to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harrie them out of the land, or else do worse, only hang them, that's all."

Thus ended the Conference of the second day, to the complete satisfaction of no one present but the King. Reynolds was thought by the Puritans to have fallen below himself<sup>a</sup>, and, consequently, lost some of his reputation. But the Puritan Ministers were insulted and ridiculed, and the ill-timed levity of James was directed against the Bishops as well as the Nonconformists. The courtiers followed at a due distance the example of their royal master. One of them said, that a Puritan was a Protestant frightened out of his senses; another, that the Puritan Ministers looked more like Turks than Christians, as might be seen by their habits. The Bishops have been accused of flattering the wisdom and learning of the King not only calling him the Solomon of the age, but saying that he was undoubtedly specially illuminated by the Spirit of God. The other courtiers were not behind the Bishops in the language of adulation, for the Lord Chancellor exclaimed, that he had never seen the King and the Priest so fully united in the same person.

At the Conference on the third day, the Bishops and other divines of the Church, together with some civilians, were called into the Council-chamber, to satisfy the King's scruples concerning the Court of High Commission. A Committee was also appointed to consider the religious wants of Ireland and the Scottish borders. After this, Reynolds and his brethren were summoned for the last time, not to debate, but to hear the alterations in the Book of Common Prayer which it had been resolved to adopt.

These not satisfying the expectations of the Puritan Ministers, one of them fell on his knees, and prayed that the surplice and the cross might not be pressed on some godly

<sup>a</sup> Neal's Hist. Pur. vol. ii. c. i. p. 19.

Ministers of Lancashire; another solicited the same favour for some equally godly Ministers in Suffolk. The Bishops were about to oppose this concession, when the King, with a stern voice, thus interposed: “We have taken pains here to conclude in a resolution for uniformity, and you will undo all by preferring the credit of a few private men to the peace of the Church. This is the Scottish way, but I will have none of this arguing; therefore let them conform, and that quickly, or else they that are of an obstinate and turbulent spirit, I will have them enforced to conformity.”

A short time after the Conference, a Proclamation from the King shewed that he adhered to his resolution. He therein stated, that though the doctrine and discipline of the Church were unexceptionable, and agreeable to primitive antiquity, yet he had graciously submitted to hear the objections of the Nonconformists. These objections he had found to be very slender, but a few had been allowed. Therefore he commanded all his loving subjects to conform to the Liturgy, as the only established form to be tolerated within the realm, and admonished them not to expect any further concessions, or to shake his resolution.

The Conference at Hampton-Court was soon followed by the death of Whitgift; and a contemporary author of high credit has suggested that his death was hastened by his fears. He dreaded the meeting of the approaching Parliament, and suspected that the King was inclined to sanction Puritanical innovations. Yet this conjecture appears to be inadmissible: Whitgift could have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result of the Conference, and he might have there seen enough of James's arbitrary temper not to be alarmed at the interference or opposition of any Parliament assembled under such a Monarch. With truly Christian humility, the venerable Primate expressed his thankfulness that he was summoned to render an account of his Bishopric to God, rather than permitted to exercise it any longer

among men<sup>x</sup>. The loss of such a governor of the Church at the commencement of a new dynasty was severely felt, and by none more sensibly than by the King. The afflicted Monarch endeavoured to console, not his dying servant, but himself, and said that he would pray earnestly to God for the recovery of one so eminently useful, a boon which, if granted, would be one of the greatest temporal blessings that could be conferred on the kingdom. The authority which must be received with hesitation as to the cause of Whitgift's death, will be readily accepted in attestation of his excellence, that he had "consecrated his whole life to God, and all his labours to the service of the Church<sup>y</sup>."

<sup>x</sup> "Et nunc, Domine, exaltata est anima mea, quod in eo tempore succubui, quando mallem Episcopatus mei reddere rationem, quam inter homines exercere." Strype's Whitgift, book iv. c. xxxii. p. 506.

<sup>y</sup> Camden, Britan. Com. Cant. p. 241.

END OF VOL. I.

School of Theology  
at Claremont

B95 (2)  
41583 :

A 9978. 1





BX            **Carwinnen, John Bayly Somers, 1781-1832.**  
5055        The history of the Church of England, by J. B.  
C3            withen ... 2d ed. ... Oxford and London, J. H.  
1849          1849.  
V. I           2 v. 19<sup>th</sup>.  
"Notice of the author" by W. R. Browell: v. 1, p. iv-xiii.  
1. Church of England—Hist.

CCSC/mmb

A997B.1

